



Committee for Family Forestlands Meeting November 19, 2020



Pursuant to 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 19, 2020 as a virtual online meeting hosted off-site.

CFF Committee members participating:

Josh Barnard, Deputy Chief Private Forests (Secretary)
Kaola Swanson, Conservation Rep. (Voting/Vice Chair)
Glenn Ahrens, OSU College of Forestry Ext. Ex-Officio
Jim James, OSWA Executive Director Ex-Officio
S. Mark Vroman, Industry rep (Voting) Hampton Family Forests
Julie Woodward, OFRI Ex-Officio
John Peel, EO Landowner Rep. (Voting)
Wendy Gerlach, Citizen-At-Large (Voting) Pacific Forest Trust
Janelle Geddes, USFS State & Private Forestry Ex-Officio
Evan Barnes, Committee Chair & SW Landowner Rep. (Voting)

ODF Staff:

Kyle Abraham, Private Forests Division Chief
Josh Barnard, ODF Project Lead
Susan Dominique, Committee Administrative Support
Scott Swearingen, Field Support Manager
Ryan Gordon, Family Forestland Coordinator
Eric Hartstein, Interim Private Forests Deputy Chief

Members not attending:

Rex Storm, AOL/OTFS Ex-Officio
Barrett Brown, NW Landowner Rep. (Voting)

Guests/Public:

Jeremy Felty, OSWA
Steve Vaught

• **Welcome and Review of the Agenda**

• **Approval of the Minutes**

Barnard: Since we have 4 of the voting members on, if my count is correct, we can roll forward with approving minutes and those sorts of things.

Barnes: Okay. Well if someone would like to make a Motion for Approval of the October minutes that would be great.

Gerlach: They should be revised to move me under the 'membership', it has me listed under 'Guests' with that change I move that with that change we approve the minutes.

Barnes: Okay, a Motion from Wendy, is there a Second?

Vroman: Second.

Barnes: Okay all those in favor say aye or raise your hand. (All in favor.) I hear 4 okay the Motion carries and approves the minutes for the October meeting. Thank you.

• **Public Comment**

Barnes: Is there any public comment? Or anybody you know of, Susan, that it going to be joining in the meeting?

Dominique: Not that I am aware of, no. Also I think we had to approve the meeting before October as we didn't have a quorum. Is that correct?

Barnes: Okay, is that the September minutes?

Dominique: It wasn't in September, but back in June? Or May meeting.

Gerlach: I can't vote on that because I wasn't a member then, I will abstain on that.

Dominique: The September meeting had to be canceled due to the fires, I think it when back to May.

Barnes: I don't have that down as to what meeting that was that the minutes did not get approved.

Dominique: I can double check here in a little while and we can maybe add it in later.

Swanson: I think it wasn't done the last time because we didn't have enough folks that were voting members?

Dominique: It would have been at the October meeting that we had to approve the May minutes.

Barnes: So it's the May minutes we are looking to approve?

Dominique: I believe so, yes.

- **Roll Call**

Barnes: Do you want to double check that and then we will move forward? Is that possible? Okay great. So, I guess we could do our roll call and introductions briefly. So Josh the fact that the pictures aren't showing here, oh there we go. It looks like we have 9 people on here.

Barnard: I show 15 total participants at the moment.

Barnes: Some are in the box seats and some in the cheap seats? Okay. So let's go around, how about the Department of Forestry first?

[Roll call as noted above.]

It looks like Eric we are going to switch to you and you are going to provide the Private Forests Division update?

- **Private Forests Division Update** – Eric Hartstein

Hartstein: Yes thank you Evan, I think we had mentioned at the last meeting that the Post-Fire Recovery and Senate Bill 1602 are really kind of driving the issues for the Division for the foreseeable future anyway. And we are going to be covering these topics as specific agenda items, so this might be a little bit brief but there are some other things we are tracking right now including the State Revenue Forecast was released yesterday. The Quarterly Forecast that comes out. And the gist there is that it was fairly optimistic given the times that we are in. I think the first sentence of the report really drives home the main point which is, while the economic recovery continues the virus remains in control. And that was the message. So the forecast has the economic indicators and the primary revenue sources are tracking pretty closely with the September Revenue Forecast which we were tracking was much improved over what was forecast back in the spring. And it's fairly stable at this point with the caveats related to COVID and the assumptions that there is going to be a vaccine available for the public in 2021. But really looking at a full recovery by the middle of 2023. It kind of varies by industry but the estimate now is early recoveries in e-commerce, health care and office jobs. And late recoveries in both retail, manufacturing, timber industry and public sector outlook is in average recovery in 2023 timeframe to get back to employment levels before the recession. So, I'll stop and see if there are any questions on the forecast and how it might relate here?

Barnes: When you talk about recovery is back to what it was, what is prior to the virus becoming widespread in February or something? Using that as a benchmark to go back to?

Hartstein: Yeah, that was the graph going back to, I don't know if it was full employment as the benchmark but close to.

Barnes: I know it gets a little off for forestry but economic and the economy, but I see disaster to small business for sure across the board. Eating in restaurants, hospitality getting the main hits but I've talked to timber people who you know they are on the edge when prices are good there is a lot of stuff to go on but, and prices are good. But they can't afford not working and having crews that have to separate. It's really hard so, I think you are going to see other hits too. I've seen them here directly. Hurry vaccine!

Hartstein: Yeah. That was the main thrust of the revenue forecast was just that! Hurry vaccine!

Barnes: I hope it will get to us at Warp Speed!

Hartstein: So speaking of COVID we of course have an update, as I'm sure everybody knows we are in a 2 week freeze not in the State to stop the rapid spread of COVID and along with that there are some other things that are included for State employees and Executive branch, continue to work from home at the greatest extent possible, and close offices to the public and in offices where closure is not possible, continue to limit in-person interactions either by appointment only or things of that nature to really reduce chances of COVID transmission person-to-person contact in State offices. For travel we have non-essential work travel is not allowed. Essential travel is limited to the core functions of work and actually Josh and I were just talking before this meeting, that at least for the Executive Branch employees, if there are interstate travel functions, people potential going out to visit relatives for Thanksgiving that there is a mandatory quarantine now upon return from out-of-state.

Barnes: Okay the next report has to be upbeat! Sorry it's just the reality of things. We had a grandson born August 18th in D.C. and we have no path forward to get to go see him. It's disheartening. So the work plan review, any other comments to Eric's report there? Anything to add? So the Work Plan Review, what kind of changes, or do we need to make any changes, want to go through that? [Screen share.]

- **CFF Work Plan Review**

Dominique: I apologize for any confusion. I didn't have the work plan document that hopefully he's going to be showing you right here. And I sent out what I could pull from the last year's Report. So I put this right one in this morning.

Hartstein: Yeah this is the one I pulled up, everyone see it okay? This is a reflection of the discussion at the October meeting, these topics were discussed and we tried to incorporate all the comments that were discussed at the October meeting. But we definitely want to open up discussion to see if there is anything that we may have missed or any additional feedback on the work plan.

Barnes: It is very thorough sure. We are up against Seedling issues once again. I don't know that there is a solution at hand for that. But, Mark what have you guys been doing, did you lose much ground in the fire?

Vroman: Fortunately, we are a really coastal dominated land base, so west of I-5 is the majority 99.9% of our ownership. We have a couple in the Power Line Fire and those over at the coast were close to some satellite properties we own. We did put equipment out helping the local people with managing that fire but we managed to lose zero acres and we feel very fortunate about that. But seedlings is going to be of paramount concern for industry as well as other private. But going forward I'm confident there will be some commerce developed. Nurseries will expand. There is going to be such a demand that supply will have to increase. And I think that nurseries will respond but that won't be overnight. It will take a while.

Barnes: Yeah, Josh, how is the seed supply from up at Carlton?

Barnard: Yeah, St. Paul, Schroeder Seed Orchard. Eric may have had more recent conversations with Mike but I don't think seed is perceived as an issue at the moment. And the way this is going to play out over the time frame that is likely but I will let Eric add more if he has had more recent discussions with Mike.

Hartstein: Yeah, I think that is right, seed is not the bottleneck right now.

James: There has been a lot of conversation and Ryan Gordon has been having that with a large group of folks and I think he is at 10 o'clock and will report. There has been a lot of conversation about the need for seedlings and lots of recovery. Glenn is on that group as well. I think a lot of this will likely be covered at 10 o'clock.

Barnard: So recognizing that Evan you weren't able to be there and digest the conversation at the last meeting and I don't think John Peel was either. Part of the discussion was, how do we prioritize what work comes before the Board? And this year that has changed for us. As you can imagine the response after the fire season there is a huge recovery effort and pretty much the rest of the agenda, other than SB 1602 today is focused on various components of that and so, one we moved Post-Fire Recovery on the top after the discussion at the last meeting and SB 1602 second. And not that the list is prioritized but those were the primary new items that were added. The only thing we removed from the list was Food Plots in terms of input to the Board of Forestry and Key Topics because that is done so, the challenge here is how do we show where we would interface with the Board as well and we may have less scheduled interactions with the Board this year because our focus now is completely on SB 1602 and is also on the recovery effort. So that was part of the discussion. I think we have all the topics here. I just wanted to share that for context. But if you' all feel comfortable that all the topics are there that's kind of the first step in the process. But Jim is right, I think the way I would characterize it is there has been two or three focus areas surfaced here at CFF that we have had additional small group meetings to continue to move them forward and they will be reported out on later today in terms of Seedlings, Landowner Outreach and some of the other recovery efforts post-fire.

Barnes: So maybe we punt that until 10 when Ryan is around.

Hartstein: Yes.

Barnes: What about any of the other bullet points under Post-Fire Recovery?

Peel: Evan, this is John, Water Quality? Where is the information going to come from item 3 the first bullet? Streamside Protections Review, will we have documentation at some point?

Barnes: I'm assuming that is coming through the Department of Forestry Josh, is that right?

Barnard: I can let Eric weigh in here but I think when we started to frame this up, Eric and I worked on this, since the last meeting and that section probably does need cleaned up. The Siskiyou Streamside piece we technically consider that complete. But there is still ongoing stream monitoring and those sorts of things, as topics may arise so we were considering those as separate topics that could arise throughout the year. So, John is your question, is do we need a component of that under Fire Recovery piece? Or is it just a stand-alone item and how would you receive that information?

Peel: Right, it was the latter. A look at where things stand. I haven't seen an updated review and it would be nice to know how that is going.

Gerlach: So Josh, what I have heard from Julie yesterday is they are doing a study on the non-federal lands for post-fire recovery on erosion and the waterway input. And thought that would be out in the next month, is that you're understanding?

Barnard: I think Eric has been the most dialed into that.

Gerlach: I think that covers that riparian areas for family forestlands as far as post-fire. Are you saying that the Department has a team working on gathering data on that?

Hartstein: As it relates to fire recovery there is and we'll talk about this also a little bit more. I think when Kyle joins us to talk about the statewide effort. Actually quite soon there's going to be a series of reports for the non-federal lands

impacted by the fires through the ETART process. ETART stands for Erosion Reduction Assessment Teams... I think that this is the first time I've gotten that right. I know there are some very close to final drafts that are being worked on right now. And that is in addition to the Forest Service BAER teams that have pulled together some very useful data in reports that actually fed into the process. But probably going down the path too far, we'll save it for later.

Swanson: So can I just ask, John you are asking about that as it relates to fire recovery, not specifically the Siskiyou Streamside Protection Review, because I believe and correct me if I am wrong Eric or Josh. But because of the Timber and Conservation MOU HCP process the Siskiyou Stream rules are on hold? So I don't think that review is moving forward any more than it has at this time. Is that right?

Barnard: That is correct. And something, forgive me, we talked a little bit about that at the last meeting. And later today we have a little bit on SB 1602 and I can go through that for the folks not able to attend last meeting. That is the legislative implementation for the Timber and Conservation MOU that was generated last February and that does technically provide an end point for the Siskiyou Streamside Protections Review because it directs in statute to go ahead and adopt rules for the Siskiyou georegion. If I can answer more questions in more detail this afternoon.

Peel: Thank you that helps. I wasn't at the last meeting. My ZOOM failed.

Swanson: Can I ask a question about the Post-Fire Recovery that is further down with Seedlings, the labor pool, family forestlands and financial resources. I would love to tackle those in this Committee, but would also like to know if there is a new post-fire recovery council for wildfires that the Governor put together? It might be helpful to understand their work plan and how they are tackling some of these issues. How we may benefit or feed into it?

Hartstein: Yeah, Kaola that's, Kyle will get into that here at 11:30 when he's on. And yeah that's also something that the Seed & Seedling Group has been struggling with as well. Issues around labor pool capacity. So a couple of different items today.

Barnes: Okay anything else, are we going to wait for Kyle and/or Ryan are both going to be around?

Hartstein: Yeah.

Barnes: I see Kyle later on, okay. Moving down the line, we talked about Water Quality. Any more comments? Obviously that directly relates to fire there for sure. It seems like SB 1602 will be a shadow on everything right? Taking a lot of you guy's time? Okay, Family Forestland Viability? Wildland/Urban Interface Opportunities? Could also replace that word with 'disaster'!

Peel: I would say we don't want more opportunities!

Barnes: I live in one, but water supply and keep everything cut back around dwellings but more and more as we build up into the hills and you see it. Of course the other day we toured down through the Phoenix and Talent area, 2300 homes, a lot mobile homes and trailers but boy, they burned completely. All the way through. So, and they are right next to the freeway, concrete all around. The fire burned between the river and the freeway. So, okay the Eastern Oregon Specific Needs are definitely special for sure. Any comments there, John from you?

Peel: It's just this has not been a bad season on the east side but everything we saw on the west side is applicable here and you have communities like Joseph that at the moment have two housing developments going on that are going to add a lot more expensive homes in areas that are fire-prone. Not necessarily forest but grasslands, transition zones. The problem continues.

Barnes: And then the Outreach and Education, that's something you talked about the 2469 Second Dwelling, is that what we are targeting there? I thought we would get some real traction there but with the virus and stuff it really has put a lid on

that. I did see that I had a list of counties that had adopted that. And fortunately Douglas County was one of them. But I guess it is optional to do that. But is there an effort otherwise that you are thinking, Josh, or Eric?

Barnard: So, didn't we remove that last time? There is some ongoing general conversations around outreach in general. Evan, I think we were thinking about how do we connect with the legislature and try to get some airtime for that. But several folks on the Committee, Kaola, Jim and others the current conversations of how do we reach non-industrial family forest landowners. So left it on, I don't know if that has to be the decision to be for the Committee that if we established some sort of outreach system there are all sorts of reasons for why we would like to reach all the various landowners out there. So, I don't know if Kaola, Jim or anyone else have a perspective on that relative to keeping that on the work plan but a little bit different process?

James: You might just take off the Second Forest-dwelling as a primary topic. And just leave it broad enough, there are lots of things that we could outreach to family woodland owners and in all likelihood fire will be the primary one for 2021.

Barnes: That sounds like a good idea Jim! It's out there but probably down the list of priorities for sure.

James: So Outreach and Education on Family Forest Issues. Period. That is broad enough to cover anything that comes up that needs to be covered.

Barnes: Okay, Recreational Immunity, get a shot for that and a virus at the same time? That's going to take a checkbook to make that happen. So a comment about that, I think that is part of an ongoing thing?

Barnard: The history I can recollect there, you know the discussion was that if that topic resurfaces there may be an interest by CFF for membership from CFF to try and figure out how they would appropriately engage in that conversation kind of like the Additional Dwelling right? Outside the scope of what we do here at Forestry but it has a policy nexus for CFF. Membership on the CFF.

James: There was an effort to get a law passed that gave liability protection for forestland owners who had visitors on their property and it made a lot of sense. But there were too many attorneys on the Senate Committee that reviewed it and apparently their love for lawsuits...I guess its easy make attorney jokes, but because of that it never went anywhere. And if it re-surfaces in my opinion it would be something that would be good for family forestland owners to have. I'd like to leave it on there, if it is likely to come up in the next session is probably low.

Barnes: Alright moving down, Marbled Murrelet rulemaking what is the actual status of that? That's in rulemaking and is there a timeframe there, Josh or Eric that we are looking at?

Barnard: So, Marbled Murrelet is still considered an active project for us. We've done a little bit of outreach, we were originally scheduled to engage with stakeholders last spring when COVID hit. We reached out to stakeholders and the preference at the time was to delay and see what the environment looked like a few months out. Obviously that operating environment hasn't changed. And so we were thinking about trying to restart the project in the August/September time frame but the Labor Day fires occurred and as you've heard us discuss Senate Bill 1602 because it is directed in statute now and the recovery effort after fire we will likely not start that up until next spring. Our plan is right now and we have set some planning around this that there's the possibility we will restart that rulemaking effort next spring. Of course we will be evaluating the COVID environment and our work relative to recovery and whatever else is facing us at that time. But it has a tentative re-start plan next spring.

Barnes: Okay, Protected Resource Sites. Are we talking about our sites? Or just resource, I guess that includes all of them?

Barnard: I believe that was a higher level conversation around the entire set of rules that we have around whatever are protected resource sites, those would be our Threatened and Endangered Species. When I went through the list and looked

at where we were headed on SB 1602 I went ahead and left that as a topic. The ultimate goal of SB 1602 is to address possible aquatic species. I don't know if it will be before the Board this next year. Protected Resource Sites actually it's less likely that we will but at some point in the future that topic is going to be a discussion with the Committee depending upon where we head with various topics. So we could remove it for now given it's not a near-term topic but it will be embedded in some of our other conversations.

Barnes: Okay, alright. And pardon not knowing, but what is the NWOS?

Barnard: I'll keep answering these Eric because it's probably my shorthand that didn't provide a lot of information. So that's actually I think would be a new bullet underneath the Board component and I added it as a placeholder, Evan based on the comments of the Board members at the July Board Meeting. So if you remember correctly, one Board member had an interest in hearing more about the National Woodland Owners Survey data that was mentioned? Which is related to the work on the CFF Fact Sheet and other things. And I put that on their as a placeholder, there is no timeline with which we were required to follow up with that. But as we re-engage in those discussions and get it a place, we may want to incorporate that. Essentially they would just like to hear an update if there is any new information in that. New dataset that is out there currently.

Woodward: Can I just say, Josh or anyone else interested they did release the 2018 data is now public so I can forward that onto anyone that is interested.

James: Julie is that the one that you sent me? Or is there one updated from that? You sent me one last year.

Woodward: Yeah this is, we could access it but it couldn't be used in public for any publication or anything yet. But this all now finalized and updated data they released publically last week.

James: Could you forward that to me?

Woodward: I will I will forward the link to everybody.

James: Thank you.

Barnes: Okay, and Josh any movement or change on the Board of Forestry members?

Barnard: Eric do you want to...

Hartstein: Yeah, It's, nothing has changed since last month. I think there is still planning to have a December Legislative Days where the Senate will convene and confirm appointments to Boards and Commissions and I think as of January the Board of Forestry will have up to 4 vacancies at that point.

Swanson: Are they proposing a slate for that December Session? Is the slate the same...?

Hartstein: Yes to the first question and I don't know to the second. Unless Josh has any other insight there?

Barnard: No, I have the same level of knowledge that Eric does here.

Barnes: Opportunities around EOA Vitality? Any comments there?

Barnard: So just to make sure, because it has another abbreviation in there, that would be the Eastern Oregon Area or side of the State and opportunities around that and that also has a nexus, I think we talked about that a little at the last meeting, there were comments at the July Board around that as well. Seeking areas where there were opportunities for both the Board and CFF to work on any opportunities there so.

James: Did they define what opportunities they were talking about?

Barnard: No they did not at the meeting. It was just a comment where I think there is a recognition of some of the previous reports recognizing some of the challenges on the east side. And if I remember the comment correctly not word for word, but along the lines of it would be great if CFF and the Board were looking for common areas where they could continue to improve opportunities on the east side.

Barnes: Yeah, it ties in, okay, emerging issues I think that is just staying on tap for things that come up that we don't know about at this point. I guess we could figure out what a few of them are but don't need to. Okay, Forest Health, Fire, maybe there could be a little bit more patience for prescribed burns now. You think? Doug getting itchy to start some stuff on fire?

James: Evan there is still an issue on prescribed burning close to communities and forestland next to an urban area that is regulated by DEQ not the Department of Forestry. Clackamas and Washington Counties have big areas and that's there is effort to have the DEQ to be more open to burning. But it's been unsuccessful. That one needs to stay on the list.

Woodward: I might suggest that we, for the Fire maybe Glenn could organize like, Carrie Berger or someone with the new OSU Fire Program to come in and talk about it and do an overview. Because I think it's going to be really beneficial for small woodland owners, family forestland owners around the State to have those additional Extension that are focused on fire and we've been working with them already for After-the-Fire but maybe there is some work there too to reach landowners.

James: I think that's a great idea Julie!

Barnes: Yeah.

Gordon: And if I could jump in there for a moment too? This is Ryan Gordon, I'm joined in here secretly in the background! There's also a little working group, it's gotten much larger recently that is tied in through the State Prescribed Fire Council and Carrie and I have kind of now with all my focus going towards Post-Fire Restoration, we are going to share the task of facilitating discussions around trying to increase opportunities to use Prescribed Fire particularly on NIPF lands and I know that the Fire Program is working on some training curriculum and we are also working closely with Andrew Owen and NRCS to look at opportunities to be able to provide more cost share for some of that work. And I'll stop there that's probably enough. But anyway, there is all good conversation there.

Gerlach: What does that look like in terms of regions? I am assuming the... to treat with prescribed fire would you use would be very different in different kinds of forests in different locations in the State. So where are you focusing that effort?

Gordon: So yeah the prescriptions would look different site by site and would also depend on the objectives for any particular treatment. A lot of the work right now is really focused on the eastside of the State and when we talk about prescribed burning we are not talking about, I think folks always think about burning a unit. We might also be talking about just pile burning and broadcast burning as well. So there is a range of different activities that fall under the guise of prescribed burning.

Ahrens: It definitely varies by region. The person that we hired, the new Extension Fire Specialist for the Willamette Valley and west side Cascades, actually the whole Cascades region, anyway, Amanda Rowe has expertise with prescribed fire. She is part of that team. So in terms of nuances and different regions that will be covered by the different regional specialists. Prescribed Fire is a topic across all the regions but it's clearly very different in the Willamette Valley and near more populated areas under air quality control basins and such and Amanda is quite familiar with that because that has been part of her experience. Of course that is some of the most interesting and challenging territory for prescribed burning I think. But definitely has a great deal of expertise in working with Ryan and between ODF and OSU and other, the Nature Conservancy and a lot of collaborators are forging ahead with this.

Barnes: So Glenn, that area she covers is Cascades all the way from border to border? Really?

Ahrens: Pretty well, the Cascades from wherever the boundary is with Southwest Oregon and the Southern Cascades, so her territory is officially the Willamette Valley and northern Cascades. So there is a line somewhere. So you have a different Fire Specialist in your area, southwest Oregon that would include the Southern Cascades.

Barnes: Okay. Back to Jim, you mentioned Washington County, so DEQ is a statewide organization obviously but different smoke basins, or different fire areas have more specialized levels within counties?

James: Yeah, within 6 miles of large cities the prescribed burning is regulated by DEQ not Forestry, even if it is forestland. And Clackamas County if you have Ag land you can get permission to burn, if you have forest land you cannot get permission to burn period. And so we've been trying to get DEQ to be more open-minded about allowing forest slash burning and equitable to agricultural burning but so far we've been unsuccessful.

Barnes: And so, say DEQ, we are talking about an individual or is there some sort of Board?

James: I'm going to have to revert, Scott Hanson from our Clackamas County Chapter has taken the lead on that. I can't remember the name of the person at DEQ, but he is also the person who is on the ODF Smoke Management Committee.

Swanson... (unclear)

James: Yeah but the individual, yeah you are right the Commission for the DEQ would make that call. You are right. But the individual at DEQ that would oversee this activity is also on the ODF Smoke Management Committee. So I've been working directly with him. He's open-minded to doing something but nothing seems to ever happen.

Barnes: Eric or Ryan, or Josh, what's the push from Doug or Peter on prescribed burning? Is there an effort that they are making or they are waiting to see what happens?

Vroman: I am just dovetailing on what Jim was saying, I've been involved trying to do some prescribed burning in that Washington County area and it is the rule set with DEQ that virtually eliminates your ability to qualify for a permit. And the amount of additional hazard that is building up in that urban interface is very concerning. It would be nice to see DEQ come in and discuss that. I think it would be extremely eye-opening!

Swanson: Do you think there are...prescribed burning programs so that folks that are doing it could be certified? Would that help reduce DEQ's nervousness?

Vroman: One of the big issues with DEQ is that they are complaint-driven program. So as soon as the complaints start coming in they are very averse to having any kind of complaint. And they are just, and with that as your guiding reference you are not going to allow any kind of burning because people will complain. And having an adverse effect as limited in duration as that fire would be it would still generate complaints that would activate their system.

Barnard: And Evan, to kind of respond to your question, I don't think there has been a huge shift in like, policy in the last month or two. I would say, there was lots of great work done with the Governor's Wildfire Council and there is still support for that process and some of the recommendations coming out of there. There were also recent rule changes that I know were to provide more flexibility around prescribed burning in terms of intrusion into Sensitive Receptor Areas. They did as a recommendation or guidance ask folks this year singularly if there was COVID in some of those impacted areas and they were at a certain response level that they modify that back to the old rules which were a bit more restrictive meaning no smoke into a Sensitive Receptor Area. So I think there was a little more flexibility. I don't know if Mark has any experience with those rules in terms of the SRA but they also did recommend backing off that a little bit during the COVID environment due to the impacts to air quality and that sort of thing. Those have been the different pieces at play. And so a lot of it will depend on how future discussions go post-Labor Day events at this point.

Barnes: So Sensitive Receptor Areas are basically people?

Vroman: The urban interface. Where people live. But then DEQ prescribed fire and burning is the last option that they will approve. They want to see more, have you ground up your residual slash and dispersed it over the landscape? Or hauled it away for firewood or other means of reducing that load before fire? So fire is on their list as the last opportunity they want to pursue.

Barnes: Yeah. Okay. Let's see moving down here. So, maybe Kaola, was there any change from the Wildfire Council original report that came out and subsequent stuff. Was there a change in any of that?

Swanson: As far as I know, the Wildfire Council was talking about reconvening it seems like there were some rumors about that. I don't know that it has. I think instead there is the Wildfire Recovery Council that is meeting. ODF would know better than I would...

Barnard: And Evan to clarify, my comments were in regards to, you know there was a fair bit of mitigation proposed to the Wildfire Council. So, right now there are a lot of different pieces, just as Kaola noted, the Wildfire Recovery piece. Some of that maybe taking precedent at the moment in terms of where that was at. That's where any major shifts in policy I would expect to come from through that type of forum.

Swanson: And there may also be initiative to introduce some of the legislation introduced last session that was outcome of the Wildfire Council work may be re-introduced this session.

Barnes: Those are really non-binding recommendations anyway right?

Gerlach: I was going to ask what was meant by mitigation of the wildfire council recommendations.

Swanson: There was a Mitigation Sub-committee that was focused on improvements in the forest. I think those recommendations are what people are trying to move forward, along with many others.

Barnes: Okay the last couple of items, Forest Chemical Use and then Seedlings pops up again there. Any comments to those two items? We've got Seedling Availability under Post-Fire Activities but I guess we could keep it there. Then, Climate Change, Cap and Trade and Carbon, Adaptive Management... comments from anybody on those? Keep them on there? Okay. So Ryan?

Gordon: I am trying to cover multiple meetings at once here today, so I am bouncing back and forth a little bit. I think I am available till about 10:20 or so and then I've got to hop over and be prepared to present another forum.

Barnes: But we are your most important meeting today, right?

Gordon: Absolutely!

Barnes: Why don't you jump in on the Post-Fire Recovery then? And we'll start working on that.

- **Post-Fire Recovery/ Seedling Availability Update**

Gordon: I know my name appears on the agenda several times today and I will be bouncing back and forth. I've got you guys on my iPad over here, and I'll just keep it dialed in and join as I can. So, Post-Fire Recovery, Seedling Availability Update. So maybe it makes sense to start with the other meetings I am bouncing back and forth to today. I've been working with the ETART team, the Erosion Threat Assessment and Reduction Team which, here, I'll just read my notes, this is the introduction I am giving at the other meeting! This was an opportunity extended to us by FEMA to have folks from Federal agencies who are familiar with post-fire assessments come in and help provide expanded post-fire assessments for the four major wildfires that burned on the western side of the Cascades. We are talking about Riverside, Beachie Creek, Lion's Head, Holiday and Archie. And they've been here for the last 4 or 5 weeks and I've been pretty

heavily engaged with them as they have worked to essentially take some of the analysis and assessments that were already done on those impacted federal lands and extend them to include State and private lands impacted as well. And part of this has been a training opportunity for the State. We've done our best with the limited resources that we collectively have to recruit folks from State agencies, local and county governments and municipalities as well as other local organizations such as SWCDs and Watershed Councils to pair up with federal resource specialists and get out on the ground and create some assessments and reports and I think that the greatest value in all this are the datasets and the maps, etc. that are coming forward out of that process. Their immediate focus has been on life and safety as well as some key ecological impacts. But all of this information is going to feed into the State's recovery response to the fires. So, the State has put together a Cultural and Natural Resources Recovery Task Force. And this is linked into a number of different FEMA functions, this is SRS 7 state recover function 7. And that is a multi-agency group that is being co-led by ODF, OWEB and DEQ that will help coordinate the State's response to the wildfires from that Cultural and Natural Resources lens. And the ETART analyses are kind of the first step in that process in terms of helping to identify a lot of the immediate threats and needs and begin to prioritize those and connect them with the potential funding opportunities for mitigation. So that's where most of my time has been dedicated since transitioning from fire response to fire recovery. And that work is wrapping up this week with a series of presentations today and tomorrow. And we expect to have those reports and data sets available in the next couple of weeks. Those reports are also going to be available and posted on ODF's YouTube site. We are recording them. So that is one really important piece of the conversation. There is a funding sub-group there as well. That is looking to connect those priorities with different funding opportunities. Let's see what else should I talk about with Post-Fire Recovery? I know that I am not going to be available for the Post-Fire Recovery Section at 11:00. So Andrew Owen I know is going to join from NRCS and he will be able to talk some about the EQIP offerings that NRCS has. We are now in a second signup period for an emergency EQIP offering for landowners impacted by fires this last season and we also have an Emergency Forest Restoration Program (EFRP) signup open from November 2nd through the end of December. And this program has traditionally been our best mechanism. It's a challenging route but the best mechanism we've had to kind of fund post-fire restoration from beginning to end. Trying to think of, let me pause there and see if there are any questions.

Hartstein: Maybe before you leave try and kick off the Seedling Availability. That's been a big part of all of this.

Gordon: Yeah, let me grab my notes from yesterday's conversation. So, of course it's great if we can find some resources to help folks with restoration and reforestation, but it's no good if we don't have seedlings available to get in the ground. This Committee knows that has been an ongoing conversation and an important topic and challenge in particular for NIPF landowners. So some of that challenge comes in sort of lack of experience and understanding of the process to order seedlings. And part of it comes in from logistical challenges around needing relatively small orders in comparison to what nurseries are accustomed to filling for larger landowners, larger industrial landowners. And the market doesn't really have much of any kind of spec, seedlings available on spec (speculation) anymore. And so one of the best options for smaller landowners is to take their orders and batch them together into larger orders with nurseries. And then if we throw the wildfire component on top of that it really complicates things even more. Because it's an unexpected event. No one has been planning or growing seedlings in advance. And we also want to make sure with seedlings that we are getting the right tree for the right place, the right seed zones. And with this particular event, industry is going to be challenged for several years with seedling supply, I'm sure. And I know that some large industrial landowners are already making adjustments to their operations to divert and bring more seedlings into these fire areas. None of that is probably not a surprise to anyone here. So what are we doing about it? We had a great working group that has met many times over the past several years and they've come together and a number of them are represented here on this Committee. And so we're working a few different lines. First of all we are really looking at those immediate needs. How do we start to try to get some seedlings ordered now to potentially have them in hand as soon as late 2021? And so we are working on some estimates of need based on vegetation mortality, mapping the ETART team has done. We are potentially going to be looking at information in FERNs and just also word-of-mouth. What we are hearing from landowners in terms of their needs. So we are trying to get some of those initial estimates. At least some kind of, like we said yesterday on the call, some kind of dart board estimate, if you will. And then looking at opportunities to leverage funding from potentially a few different sources to be able to get those ordered. Assuming that we can find space to grow them, either with private nurseries or potentially through some kind of partnership with the J. Herbert Stone Nursery. Challenges there though include available space in nurseries to grow and also access to labor. There are some critical labor shortages as well as

well as in industry. So we are looking at that, we are also trying to look a little bit long term. We recognize there is an immediate need that we need to try and cover now, but looking longer term we'd like to try and stand up some kind of organizational structure in the west side of the State to try and provide a longer term solution. Looking at trying to model this potentially after the Private Lands Forest Network which operates up in Northeast Oregon and I know Jamie Knight has shared some of that with this Committee in the past. And that could look different depending upon how that comes together but essentially we would be looking to develop an organization for batching orders and placing them, receiving those orders and storing them. And then distributing them through some kind of a network that we would try to assemble and manage. Region 6 Forest Service; State and Private Forestry is interested in potentially providing some funding to help us to get something like that put together. And then just going through my bulleted list from yesterday, Eric so hopefully I am hitting the right marks here. There's a few other ideas a foot as well. So, I've been contacted by the Arbor Day Foundation, by the American Forest Foundation and they are tied into a larger conversation around this Trillion Trees Initiative. Which Diane Haase with State and Private Forestry, she's the Western Region Nursery and Seedling Specialist. And that group is going to be meeting in early December to look at options through this Trillion Trees Initiative which is an international initiative, I guess the focus is to plant 1 trillion trees which is a lot of trees. I'm not sure we'll get there, but anyway but focused on that kind of general goal. So this group in Oregon is getting together and looking to see if we can leverage that initiative for some funding to try to have potentially some kind of trial in Oregon. And along with that I presume would be an investment to increase capacity to grow seedlings. As that is certainly going to be necessary to hit that mark. And then finally there is also a discussion particularly through the Oregon Forest Industry Council and Seth Barnes around some potential legislative concepts. One of them includes trying to revitalize the Reforestation Tax Credit and also looking at maybe trying to provide some backstop funding for private industry to encourage them to participate in that spec market. Okay that was a lot, I went through it really quickly because I am nervous about missing my cues on this other meeting. I'll stop now and hang out for a few minutes if there is some discussion or questions?

Barnes: So Ryan thanks. So the nursery in Elkton, is that still a State property or has that sold?

Gordon: It is not. The Department of Forestry no longer owns or operates a nursery. The only resource that we have left there on the nursery side, is of course we have our seed orchard and on the nursery side we have our Nursery Account. Which does have funding in it and the statutory authority there basically says we can either operate our own nursery or we can leverage funds in that account to work with other growers to produce seedlings for NIPF landowners. So that is where we have that wedge to potential leverage some remaining funds there, which there is about \$200,000 to potentially front the cost for some seedlings. I do have a pilot project going with J. Herbert Stone right now. They are about to lift 24,000 seedlings for landowners in Southwest Oregon. The challenge with that is we have no source of revenue for that account. So we have to make sure we build a model where we are recovering those funds and can continue to pay it forward.

Barnes: Where is the J. Herbert Stone Nursery?

Gordon: That's down in Medford in the Rogue Valley.

Swanson: I don't want to open a Pandora's Box, if there is a way to give a brief overview of the history of why there is not an ODF operated nursery? Was that a preference? Or how did that happen?

Gordon: Well, I guess the short version of that is over time there was a lot of discussion about whether or not that nursery was competing unfairly with industry. And at some point in the late 2000's the decision was made to shutter the operations there to avoid the potential for that conflict and competition. So the nursery was closed down and the land was leased for some time to an industrial grower and the facility was eventually sold. That is my very quick because I am going to have to hop off here pretty soon, version of the story and I invite Josh or others to flesh that out.

Gerlach: I have a question on the pricing of seedlings? Given there is a shortage of supply is the price spiked? And particularly how the smaller buyers coping? I was wondering if people are planting seedlings in a less dense pattern or in response to the shortage of supply and increase of price.

Gordon: You know I don't know if others might have some insights there? I don't know the seedling market all that well to be able to answer the question of what's happened with price. Certainly, supply and demand would suggest that. Another bottleneck moving forward will be access to the human resources necessary to do the planting as well. I don't know if other folks can chime in on the market conditions?

Vroman: I know for our company this is a two-year contract so we have our seed at the nurseries and our seedlings go in different density in the bed and we have a contract for pricing as we go and they are paid for on delivery. So annually it's a negotiated thing and I'm sure there will be some impact with supply being restricted and the nursery beds being limited as well, price will go up. It will lag a little bit given the two year commitment for growing a seedling.

Ahrens: Yeah the labor issue both for increased nursery capacity and also planting in the field actually looms very large. Is not being able to get the help needed to handle the extra volume, even handling the current volume is a challenge. So, but I think Ryan for your benefit, I know you have to leave, so Eric and I and Jim were all on the talk with the Seedling Group so we can carry it forward. Thanks for your concise summary!

Gordon: I don't know how concise it was but thanks for continuing the conversation and I will be back as soon as I can.

Ahrens: So Eric you were there through most of that yesterday right?

Hartstein: Yeah I was and I was, did you have a question?

Ahrens: I guess if you want to summarize and carry forward and then wherever I see the need I'll come in and sound on things.

Hartstein: Sounds good. One thing I did want to share, Ryan talked about and the Committee talked about last time to try to get a ballpark handle on what the need might be out there. We had Michael Lathrop in GIS shop did an analysis on NIPF ownership within the 4 major fire footprints. And overlaid the BAER Burn Severity and Vegetation Mortality figures and data on top of that and (screen share) I'll share a summary of that. Can you all see that reasonably well? So this is a summary of Archie, Beachie, Holiday Farm and Riverside Fires. So total acres of NIPF inside the footprints is 58,000... and then the vegetation mortality acres of non-industrial forest basal area and mortality 51 to 75%. 6500 for mortality and 76 to 90% and then 18,000 acres of the vegetation mortality. And 91 to 100%. So, I think that gives at least a coarse understanding of where the non-industrial private forest acres have been impacted by the fires.

Swanson: Can you explain the soil burn severity number a little bit?

Hartstein: Yeah, thanks the soil severity is also a product of the USFS BAER data. They have collected data on, remote sensing, likely ground-trothed in areas. Somebody who knows how this was done, feel free to chime in? But so they did over the entire fire footprints measured the soil burn severity and the same application to NIPF over those data and this is what came out of that. My understanding is that you can see that it is moderate of 28,000 and high soil burn severity is close to 4000. My understanding is that this is kind of expensive. You see the vegetation mortality figures are much more weighted to the higher end of things because it was a wind-driven event.

Swanson: I am not a fire ecologist at all! So, does the high soil burn severity mean it won't naturally regenerate? Or I don't know how to interpret what that means to the landscape.

Hartstein: I am also not a fire ecologist, so, its okay, if anyone else knows? I suspect that would be the case... higher burn to establish vegetation on the land. Anybody else?

Ahrens: Yeah, actually the ETART process that Ryan was talking about, they really have a lot of really good information from the Forest Service folks that do the burn area emergency response assessment. And the key for the soil burn severity is the level of exposure and the damage to the soil and the erosion hazards. And then down the road it going to affect biological productivity will probably be effected because the seed bank being destroyed. Maybe some challenges with

hydrophobic soil when it's burned. So they use that for that level and then that is going to affect vegetation recovery but then the big one I think the assessment of where we need to plant trees and where might landowners want to plant trees but it would be the vegetation mortality. So Eric I think what you targeted here is if it is more than 50% vegetation mortality that is pretty severe loss especially in basal area which we are talking about trees not just shrubs and everything else. If you've got 75% or more of the trees killed that is very likely want to reforest that. That is one of the questions, how much of this ground is going to be reforested if they could get the seedlings, would they do it, rather than letting nature recover... I think for us the vegetation mortality is the most important one as far as trying to use it as an initial guess at the overall need or range of need. And the conservative view is well what if a 3rd of those acres needs to get planted and go out to 2/3rds and going in between those and come up with some estimates as to how many trees are needed and some assumptions about trees that are going to be planted per acre and that sort of thing. And then you come up with a range of 4 to 9 million trees or something that might be needed for non-industrial owners to plant. Put that in perspective of what Seth Barnes was estimating for the total need for reforestation related to fire. Which is a real ballpark figure of 100 million trees that need to get planted over the next 5 years, probably 2 to 3 is the hope. So putting the non-industrial need in that perspective but also look at that demand on the nursery pipeline and how much of that is going to the industrial side? And how do we carve out our niche to help with the 4 to 9 million trees needed for the non-industrial? That's what we are trying to zoom in on here.

Barnes: Ryan mentioned the money you guys set aside for nurseries or whatever, has there ever been an estimate of what it takes to stand up a nursery and start germinating seeds? Assuming there is some greenhouse space and land base needed. And obvious creature comforts for people who work there? Has there ever been a sheet developed with those factors on it?

Barnard: Not that I am aware of.

Ahrens: One could do that, but I think where we are at though, with this working group with Ryan and Eric and Jim James and others are on. We are looking first at what is the existing nursery capacity? Trying to avoid building from scratch obviously. Looking at existing capacity. What could be done to expand production? And especially again, carving out the niche for small landowners. We are just assuming the industry and we know the industry is really on top of this and they are, I've talked to the Weyerhaeuser Nursery Manager which is a huge part of this need is in their lands. But representing what we are going to be doing. And they are pulling out all the stops and they have great connections with nurseries and they are looking at a 5 year outlook on this. So, question for a non-industrial family forestland owner is what are we going to do to make sure that we can supply that need? And the working group is looking at, of course there is a lot of potential for a rough estimate of maybe 26 million trees capacity for seedlings that existing nursery capacity that is not utilized. There was a survey of nurseries done, Diane Haase with the Forest Service and Brian Kittler with American Forests and others have been doing these surveys so that's what we want to start with is looking at what the existing capacity is for forest tree seedling nurseries. And then you look at what other kinds of nurseries are there? Horticultural nurseries that might be able to help as well, but they are not tuned into the high volume forest seedling production. So we think from that there is probably a fair amount of capacity. The limiting factor is the labor. And then money to jump start it and it sounds like, and Ryan summarized quickly that a variety of irons in the fire for funding. And starting with that \$200,000 that ODF has in their account. Once we have a clear plan if the nurseries say, yeah we can expand and grow more seedlings, then there is upfront money that could jump-start that. And there are some proposals in the works for funding. So all this is happening but we left the meeting yesterday with the action item which is Jamie Knight with the Department of Forestry who also basically runs the Private Forestland Seedling Network on the eastside. They really have a great model of how to set up infrastructure using existing nurseries but also deciding what gaps need to be filled to increase capacity for small woodland owners. And we are looking at getting a seedling order in and trying to jump start this extra capacity seedling order in the pipeline for non-industrial owners. And start with some number this year to get the order in. ½ a million, a million whatever it turns out to be. There are a lot of challenges we see, the big one being the labor and cooler space for all those seedlings. And we have a great team and great model to work on but it is this urgent need to get an order in ASAP that is really driving us right now. And Jamie is really helping lead that and then we are going to huddle with her and then what Eric has presented here, this assessment of need side and matching that up with this effort to get an order in, and get the capacity side of the nursery production that is where we are at. So we are moving pretty fast and there is a lot of potential here but to me the biggest thing is how do we get creative in expanding the labor for the nurseries and

the outplanting because right now if I wanted to go out and get someone to plant a 100,000 trees for me and the landowner, I don't know Mark, you probably know how hard it is to find contractors!

Vroman: That's a very challenging market right now. Especially, this year, well any year, but right now this time of the year we are trying to pull from other agricultural industries back into forestry for that planting program. So crews are at ½ capacity right now as they are getting started, there are still crews in fire capacity right now. Seasonal employees working in the fire side of things that haven't come back to the reforestation side of their annual business. So, getting people in is a huge, huge problem and then just the capacity at the nurseries. I think a short term greenhouse produces an annual seedling that might be able to solve some of the shortfall sooner but dirt where you plant your seed is extremely, extremely limited with the number of acres available. Elkton is a great place we used to get seedlings from there all the time. I can't imagine that somebody won't pick that up somehow and try to start economically filling this void. It just sounds like the right thing to do.

Barnes: Didn't a major nursery company buy that property?

Vroman: I think it was part of IFA for a while and probably the converse at that time, seedling supply was such that they could not afford to keep production down there to their limited ability? Kind of the opposite of what we are seeing now. There's, to Ryan's point earlier there's not a lot of spec seedlings out there, nursery's aren't growing a portion of their available nursery bed in spec hoping that someone will come pick it up because there are just enough contracts to fill out their needs they don't have anything extra spec. Some people even buy that culled seedling that hits the nursery floor at a reduced price just to capture more trees in the system. So, I think everybody is trying to look at it from all angles and capture the best opportunities.

Barnes: At the risk of boring everybody. Tell me, walk me through the process so you take a seed and you have to plant that in the tubes or Styrofoam boxes in a greenhouse and propagate those, germinate them, and then you take and plant them, either as 1 year or 2 year old trees, bare root?

Vroman: We basically have two types of seedlings that come out of nurseries, there's plugs and bare root seedlings. Bare roots usually go into a, (I'll just describe it) as a very dense nursery bed in the first year growing a quantity of seedlings. They usually cull some of those out for quality and the second year they are planted in a less dense bed. So that they can actually achieve the specifications of the contract for caliper, for root growth, for shoot height. And that's what's packed out as a 1:1 so to speak. And in February of every year the nurseries will plant various sizes of container stock and some of those will go out into a nursery bed for a second year seedling. A lot of them will go into a fall planting program. We grow a 10 month seedling for our fall planting program that we put up in the high elevations before the snow actually comes in that year and we can't get back to those elevations before planting season is over. So, we catch them early instead of trying to catch them late. You know, nurseries, if they have a little bit of room they can put up a greenhouse a lot quicker than they can find more land to grow.

Barnes: So you have a 10 month? Is that from germination to putting out in the forestland?

Vroman: We are actively in our high elevations right now and we have refrigerated big box vans 65' trailers going down the road, we take them up to staging points in our higher elevation timberlands. Crews show up there and grab their daily allotments of seedlings and head out to those high elevation units. Those seedlings were put in a greenhouse February, 1st of February with the seed that we have at the bank in the nursery. Their grown, we've been lifting those out for maybe 3 weeks now. So that program will be exhausted in another week. I think we will have everything in the high country planted and then we'll start chasing the snow level down with our bare root seedlings getting the next elevations planted until the snow comes and then going lower and lower until we get it all done. Sometime in April 2021.

Barnes: Where do your seeds come from?

Vroman: We're a stockholder in IFA and so the majority of our seedlings come from IFA. As I mentioned earlier we are on a two year basically a contract for two years. Our harvest schedule might change a little bit. We might add some acres

in there. We may reduce our harvest schedule. So we will pick up seedlings from other nurseries as well some other privates around the Willamette Valley, and/or sell. If we have surplus. We do sell to other timber companies and in the past I've had a very robust program with Yamhill and Washington County selling seedlings to the small woodland owners.

Barnes: The main stopping or points of disruption in the change are germination, greenhouse space and then cultivated land space to grow them to one or two years old?

Vroman: I think that is one of the bigger. Glenn's conversation, nursery capacity and the labor are the big ones. These fires have created a significant need for seedlings and there just isn't the capacity in the system right now to respond. People would grow them if they had the ability to. There is just no doubt about it. And the ability to do that is a little off paced from the demand that we are going to see.

Barnes: Okay, well food for thought.

Ahrens: with all the partners here our focus on what do we do to add to the capacity for a few million more trees and this sort of problem analysis of where do we need to shore up capacity. There's some political issues like with the immigration policies and the VISAS that a lot of workers have to get that might get sorted out over the next year or two. And I'm not an expert in this but what does it take to increase contractor capacity to carve out another 3 million trees and grow and plant 3 million trees. A really targeted assessment of where we can fit this in. And we have a lot of different opportunities and there are people who have experience with it and we are putting our heads together. And it's going to be some combination of a subsidized agency partnership to make sure that we have the extra capacity and hopefully there will be some public/private partnerships and maybe industry can help us to be able to take overflow. For instance if we start a program and we grow a million seedlings and for some reason we can only sell 750,000 industry can absorb that easily I assume. That's what they've done on the eastside partnership. And they just have an agreement out there with some of the local large owners that help with that end of the flow so it all pencils out and it's not somebody holding the bag or throwing trees and money away. It's a puzzle that is all kind of coming together but we've got a good group working on it so stay tuned!

Barnes: Okay, I'm curious Mark, so you guys owned part of IFA over there in Elkton? Have there been conversations about expanding or are your needs met internally?

Vroman: Yeah, it's been a co-op so to speak, many owners, many people on the Board. I am not on that Board. And I don't have a lot of background on what they are thinking. I'm sure they are having conversations about appropriate response to this need. But I have spoken with IFA and tried to get their reassurances that we still need seedlings too! Don't push us out the backdoor in response. Our contracts are pretty solid and we are hoping to get as much bed space. But they were really limited about providing us more bed space if we need because there's so much demand. But that is how the capitalist system will work. IFA is very good at growing seedlings and some of these other nurseries are. There is plenty of agricultural ground in these short rotation crops that could easily be converted into some of those crops as well. And I think people will respond. They will see the value of growing that seedling and they will lease land and put it into production.

Barnes: Okay, any other comments from anybody else? We are doing pretty good for time here.

Hartstein: Just one real quick thing Evan, the summary we have almost 35,000 acres of non-industrial private forestland with the basal area mortality of 51% or higher. Only 19,000 of that within the Riverside Fire so give folks a little bit of understanding of at least in the course analysis, the bulk of that needs may be coming from Riverside.

Ahrens: Yeah we've near to see where those stats are because I wasn't really sure where the need was going to be. And I was a little surprised at how high the acreage was on the Riverside I thought it would have been higher at Beachie or Holiday. So we need that data to reaffirm that. And speaking of that so one of the challenges is the actual landowner finding out what they are going to plant and their needs and getting in touch with them to help them decide that. Because a

lot of them probably haven't even gotten to that point. *So, one role with Extension working with ODF is to you know fill that database so the landowners that are in the burned get all the intel that we can about who's already contacted ODF or Extension or others and filled the list of landowners already asking about seedlings and eventually get a system out there for them to sign up for this sort of bulk order that needs to be done on their behalf.* If all of them were calling nurseries and getting orders all lined up they don't need us right? But we are just assuming from what we know from the nurseries there are a whole bunch of folks that need seedlings that haven't ordered them yet and so we are going to build this capacity to do a bulk order that the larger producers can grab a hold of is not really on spec. And on that upfront and sell those seedlings to those folks on the list that say they needed them and it all pays for itself and trees are in the ground after years and we are on the road. But keeping track of the landowners is something that Extension is trying to start to organize that effort. We may actually end up with kind of a new entity like this Private Forestland Seedling Network (PFSN) in northeast Oregon that Jamie Knight is working with, you might wind up with a west side version of that is almost a stand-a-lone non-profit entity with help from some of us and maybe some new capacity to actually run that. For instance, Jamie, I think she estimated that two weeks to a month of her time per year is spent running that non-profit network and I think that they are in the range of 100 to 300,000 seedlings or something that they deal with depending on pluses in need with wildfire. So, we are probably looking at something like that emerging from this and it may need to persist, and not just with these fires, but we might get a handle on this persistent need to help small landowners to have an avenue to get their seedlings in this constricted market that is not trees on spec anymore. But there will be more fires in the future and there are other issues that we want to increase the market for these trees. That's kind of where we are out right now.

Woodward: Hey Glenn, thanks for the update. I agree that I think that the non-profit is a great idea for the west side and I think there comes a point where some funding is needed. Kind of a one time, make sure you talk to OFRI and we could pull some funding for that for landowners to help to get that non-profit going I think it's a great direction. I also am working with landowners and it just seems like before seedlings we even have a huge hurdle to get land cleared even, the capacity right at this point, given the cleanup. So that seems to also be part of a hurdle and this whole package.

Ahrens: Yeah I guess that is on the agenda for later too. It's just that bigger picture of the fire recovery and cleanup and of course that goes into the top, in what you call 'site prep'. We are getting a handle on the acres of the non-merchantable trees that were burned that might come under the Emergency Forest Restoration Program (EFRP) what's it going to take to prepare those sites as well as how to get those seedlings and get them in the ground. And manage vegetation if there is a 2 or 3 year delay. We are talking about seedlings getting ordered now and in the next few years. There's going to regrowth, yes there are other challenges obviously that need to be addressed.

Barnes: Okay, any other thoughts or comments?

Ahrens: And thanks Julie, invoking OFRI yesterday in our group meeting. We have the Partnership for Forestry Education and its turning into a Partnership for "Forestry Assistance" with respect to post-fire.

Barnes: Okay how about a break for a few minutes and then we'll go into the Post-Fire stuff?

BREAK

Barnes: Okay so Scott is there I guess we can proceed with Post-Fire Recovery, and Landowner Assistance/Salvage and to from there. Glenn is he back? Where's he... Glenn excuse me I have a question. So, is there sort of a primer that someone could read to understand what it would be like to start growing seedlings? I'm thinking you know here real close to where I live there is Cruise Farms, they grow and incredible amount of row crops, food crops, everything and big greenhouses not in use and a lot of land, lot of water and it there was something they could look at to see what it would actually start in the business of growing seedlings.

Vroman: Diane Haase at the Forest Service, the OSU Nursery Cooperative that, there are some resources for somebody that's what about the industry growing forest seedlings? Spec'ing out the economics and what's needed. I think if you

were to talk to them and they are interested and want to learn more. Obviously they need somebody who's pretty savvy about basic greenhouse and field nursery practices and then the business of forest tree seedlings in bulk production is pretty specialized. I think we have some pretty good guidance that we could get somebody that is interested. I would talk with Diane Haase and if you want, just send an inquiry my way and I can try to connect people.

Barnes: Okay, I'll do that. And I see also, I manage a small irrigation district in Douglas County about 85 members and we irrigate about 3500 acres and there was a big uptick in hemp growing in the last few years and a lot of that has fallen right on its face and I guess there is a lot of factors but processing the hemp into the oil or whatever seems to be a major sticking point. So there are a number of places that put up greenhouses and have land with water that are now scratching their heads over what they should do next? So, it seems like the capacity is there but I agree, I'm sure it's not just as easy as Johnny Appleseed throwing the seeds out and hoping they will all grow up. Then you've got seedlings after that and it takes expertise and experience.

Ahrens: And there's not a huge profit margin and a fair amount of risk and that's part of the reason that the forestry nursery industry has constricted a fair amount and then the higher volume producers are more successful. A smaller producer that wants to do that, an overlap with sort of a native plant and restoration seedling pipeline. There may be some avenues there. There are some pretty important safety and disease prevention aspects of nursery production with things like SOD and ...things out there that you want people to properly and safely and in a sanitary way as well. So, certainly would try to help folks that are interested. Especially more people that might have a public benefit in mind. And maybe they are not strictly profit driven but it's not a real profitable business for a small scale operator.

Barnes: Okay I will send you an email to look for her contact info. And I will talk to them locally here and see what they say. So, Scott and Ryan is gone so we'll see what we got.

8. Post-Fire Recovery

• Landowner Assistance

Hartstein: Ryan is gone and Andrew Owen from NRCS is on. He can talk about the NRCS programs related...

Barnes: I think we've all met Andrew before. I think you were in a couple of times, welcome. Scott you want to kick it off?

Swearingen: Yeah, Andrew do you want to kick it off with some of the Landowner Assistance stuff?

Owen: Sure thing, so I'll probably only need a couple of minutes and I can be around for some questions and answers. What I'll do is talk about the two programs that are directly through NRCS and then the third is EFRP. Which goes through our sister agency under USDA which is the Farm Service Agency. So I'm going to talk on that on a really high level because it's not our program. So I'll try and introduce these pretty quick and have most of the time for discussion. So we currently have a Westside Fire and an Eastside Fire Emergency EQIP funding pool. They're set up for all the 2020 Labor Day FMAG fires. So if it was under an FMAG it will qualify. All the information for those funding pools are on our website. The available counties and so forth. This specific funding pool was for emergency stabilization. So it will address soil stabilization, hazard tree removal and things of that nature. We're not targeting the long term restoration goals quite yet. So the practices that we've identified that will be included and subsequent funding available for non-industrial private forest landowners would include: Hazard tree removal; conservation cover; mulching practices and critical area planting. They are a little bit different between east side and the west side. For the most part they are the same. There is a couple of variations on how they are being applied. We did afford non-industrial private forestland owners for early start waivers. It allows them to basically start the practices much sooner, 30 to 60 days sooner than they would under general EQIP. I also was able to get a waiver for the forest management plans, so generally speaking if you are going to use EQIP dollars on non-industrial land you would have to have a forest management plan. We were able to get a waiver for that to get in quickly. We understand capacity is a big issue and trying to draft comprehensive plans would be a big barrier so that was waived. The funding pool applications 10/30 and 12/31 for the Emergency EQIP. So when we passed one we've received somewhere around 60 applications for those practices anticipating another good round by 12/31 for that funding. Along with other EQIP the general EQIP we are putting together a second Conservation Implementation Strategy (CIS)

for the longer term restoration we are still gathering data and still figuring out what the best management practices are for NIPF land but we are expecting a pretty significant amount of EQIP to be dedicated to post-fire recovery sometime mid-April. So I'll move on out of the EQIP Program and into the EWP which is another program through the NRCS. It is the Emergency Watershed Protection Program. The goals of that program are to offer through NRCS financial and technical assistance for various activities. Those activities can include: Removal of debris from streams and channels; road and culvert, bridges; reshape and protect eroded streambanks; correct damage or destroyed drainage facilities; establish vegetative cover on critically eroding lands; repairs levies and structures, and repairs conservation practices that were installed prior to the damaging event; in addition to the recovery projects NRCS may be able to purchase EWP Floodplain Easements instead of trying to recover damaged floodplain lands if it appears to be more cost effective than recovery. As of now we have 1 application from Marion County. These applications do have to go through sponsor organization. So it's not something the NRCS would be proposing it would be something where a sponsor comes to the NRCS with a proposal for those activities. Just as a little more information here. The EWP program cannot be used to address problems that existed prior to the disaster, or, to improve the level of protection above the existing level at the time of the disaster; for project operation and maintenance (so existing O&M on existing projects) to repair private or public transportation facilities or utilities; to install non-essential restoration work that will not reduce or eliminate adverse impacts to the natural disaster; or to restore projects installed by another federal agency. In terms of eligibility, I would encourage everyone to contact our State Conservation Engineer, Molly Dawson. She's Program lead for EWP. Generally speaking there is a 60 day application period for EWP from when the event was declared or when it became accessible. So as far as I know and Molly, I'd want to get confirmation from Molly but I believe that period has passed. It was 11/16 was the 60 day mark from when the events were declared. There may be a little wiggle room in regards to when those sites were accessible. So that would be something that would have to be proposed to Molly and approved if we don't have applications already.

Swanson: Its interesting Andrew... do remind me again?

Owen: It's the Emergency Watershed Protection. EWP. Again I'm kind of going through the high level stuff. We have loads of information available on our website. If you shoot me a text or email on how to get contact and more pertinent information EWP program recovery projects begin with a local sponsor or legal subdivision of State and Tribal Government. So eligible sponsors could include cities, towns, counties, conservation districts or any federally-recognized Native American tribe or tribal agency. Public and private landowners can also apply for EWP program and recovery assistance through those sponsors. So the private landowner would go through the sponsor that would be approved. I think I will leave it with that EWP we do have one application from a sponsor in Marion County. That's the only one I know of. There's been a ton of requests for information. But only the one formal application from the Marion County sponsor I know. Finally I know there are a ton of other programs out there. The ones that we are most familiar with are those that touch NRCS. The last one that I'll touch on is the EFRP Emergency Forest Restoration Program. This can offer a huge heavy lift. It does go through FSA. You are getting access to other federal dollars. So the EQIP Program that I spoke about was already allocated funds. We are going to our National office to ask for a 1:1 match. The EFRP are additional funds that we can bring into Oregon. These applications are received at the local FSA County offices and they are determined by a County Committee to determine eligibility which is done through on-site damage inspections. They look at the extent of the damage and the potential for rehabilitation going forward. Eligible forest restoration practices are quite similar to EWP which are: debris removal such as down damaged trees in order to establish a new stand. So it's important to recognize EWP might not be able to serve that role. Emergency EQIP that we put out through NRCS might not be able to serve that role. They are very focused on hazard tree EFRP can play a big role in re-establishing a new stand. So I've done a number of sites visits. Obviously lots and lots and lots of mortality, where the stands are too young for salvage potential for other reasons where you might not be able to salvage. And underplanting is not a viable alternative I think EFRP is going to be a very good alternative for a lot of landowners. But to take on the establishment of new forest stands. It can also be used for site preparation, planting materials and labor to replant those forestlands. Restoration of forestland roads, fire lanes, fuel breaks or other erosion structures. Fencing is included, tree shelters, tree tubes, to protect trees from wildlife damage and other wildlife enhancements to provide cover openings and wildlife habitat in damaged areas. A little bit more on eligibility, so in order to meet eligibility requirements non-industrial private forestland must have had or has existing tree cover immediately before the natural disaster. That's pretty easy eligibility. The land also must be owned by non-industrial private landowners group or association. Corporations or other private legal entities that have a definitive

decision-making authority over the land. The natural disaster must have resulted in damage that if untreated would impair or endanger the natural resources on the land or make or effect use of the land. So again the counties available are: Lake, Klamath, Jackson, Josephine, Douglas, Lane, Linn, Marion, Clackamas, Washington, Lincoln, Tillamook and Wasco. So basically any of the fires that impacted lands in the 2020 Labor Day Fires. One last point that I would make on EFRP funding for that program is determined by Congress. Up to 75% of the cost to implement the emergency conservation practices can be provided however the final amount is determined by the committee reviewing the application. The FSA County Committee is able to approve applications up to \$50,000 while from 50,000 to \$100,000 requires the State Committee Approval. Amounts over \$100,000 would require approval from the National FSA Office and eligible landowners would be capped at \$500,000 per person/entity per disaster. I think I will end there, I'm happy to stick around for any questions or comments on any of the programs the best I can.

Barnes: So Andrew this is just fire-related damage?

Owen: That is correct. It has to be for any of the fires that were Labor Day Fires correct.

Ahrens: If landowners call the NRCS office will they get referred to FSA or do they have to call FSA separately?

Owens: We are working on that as diligently as we can. Often what we are doing is either through to assistance with ODF or our local district conservationist... we are conducting a whole slew of assessments. Depending on the right fit. If it's a small property owner that we think we can get an application for an Emergency EQIP we are going through that route. If it looks like larger stands we are trying to collect as much information as we can about those forest stands and ship them over to FSA. The feedback that I am getting is that they are swamped. And so are we for that matter. And so are we waiting for that it's been a big capacity issue. So we're really trying to work as much as we can together to share as much information as we can to try and find the right fit. I know that's not a great answer Glenn but it's in the quick nature that we try to get these programs out.

Ahrens: And that is what I was wondering in sort of a partnership effort. And as I mentioned under reforestation discussion, I don't know if you were in on that earlier on seed and seedlings, we are trying to provide a database and keep track of all the people that have contacted Extension and ODF for assistance and right now I just say 'call NRCS' I want to have a followup list to find out. I worry about people that maybe tried to call NRCS, anyway we just want to make sure we can help people and stop them from falling through the cracks. And I am wondering, there was a discussion in this group Kaola, I think you met on the Landowner Database which I am at halftime and maybe we need to confer about that outside of this meeting. But for our part Extension and ODF we agreed that we are going to start track all these contacts that we are getting and have them followup as well as the blanket outreach. And trying to extract the tax lot, landowner list from moderate to high burn severity and figure out exactly who's on that list. Who have we already contacted that is on that list? And who we haven't contacted to do the outreach about all these different available programs and part of that outreach is providing those contacts with NRCS and FSA. And I'm wondering about how I do that in the best way. And is NRCS or anybody else doing a mailing to the same list? We want to make sure we all compare notes and maybe it doesn't hurt to have more than one outreach attempt but for our part we want to make sure there is a blanket approach to all the landowners affected by the fires. Especially in the high severity that we now have the intel from the maps. So if I emailed you and maybe you can even help me compose what is the best contact list if we were to send them a mailing with NRCS and FSA people.

Owens: Sure we can definitely do that. We've got a good contact list for FSA based, county contact list, we've got the complimentary list for NRCS and either way the information for these programs aside from EWP they are going to have to go through the FSA for eligibility. They handle the eligibility on our behalf. So if someone gets in for EQIP they have to go to FSA anyway for eligibility. So we've got that link already connected. The one thing that I would caution is we are very aware of and very strict with our PII Rules, so sharing landowner information, we've got pretty strict guidelines and rules about that. Something we will have to make sure we articulate and figure out how to navigate through that.

Ahrens: Yeah, we were discussing that in our group with ODF I'll keep track of people that come through our gateway. And I'll make sure to follow up with them and make sure that they were are able to contact NRCS or FSA. But if most people come directly to you and not through me, I'm not going to be able to ask you to give me your list.

Owen: We can find creative measures I think.

Ahrens: I could just forward you, we are talking about postcards where we have physical addresses and the email list we already have, Facebook all that kind of stuff but want to make sure that we kind of have good cross-referencing and somebody is going to be following up with people so they don't fall through the cracks.

Owen: Sure, sure. I think EFRP is going to be our, I know what we have in terms of budgets for our local funding and statewide funding current for the emergency EQIP, next spring EQIP, and I don't think it will touch what we can get access to with EFRP. These landowners are going to, on all the visits that I have been in most cases it's a full re-start and our State allocations for EQIP probably won't go as far as we'd like. So I am really encouraging the EFRP efforts.

Ahrens: We've all been looking to that for the higher need and volume.

Swanson: Can I quick just get an answer to this but just want to double-check. It seems like the EFRP and EWP would both be federal programs. One through NRCS and one through the Farm Service. If you can get 75%, there is still the 25% you can't use those programs to match each other? But you could run them simultaneously on the same piece of ground? Assuming that they are funding different actions would you be able to utilize them both? Or are people really sort of in one track or the other?

Owen: No, and I think that is a really good question! I clarified that last week and I don't know the answer for EWP and EFRP, they are different Farm Bill programs or authorities so as long as they are not doing the same practice I would assume they could be complimentary. I did clarify with EQIP and EFRP they can be used simultaneously their ceiling limits don't impact one another so our EQIP eligibility is capped at \$450,000 per permittee per Farm Bill. EFRP is a 1/2 million dollars and those do not collide basically. So, in theory a landowner could get access to almost a million dollars as long as they are not the same...I think that is what you were asking?

Swanson: Yes, that's what I was asking, then they would still need match for either one of those independently from one another?

Owen: Yes, except for EQIP. EQIP is not a grant, we do contracts with landowners at a certain pre-established rate. So as long as they can get the work done, we don't say you have to provide it's generally set up, the economics set up for a 25% match. But we don't collect receipts and require that hard match. If you can get the work done, if we give you a \$1000 and you get the work done for \$1000 you don't have to provide match.

Swanson: Great!

Barnes: Okay, thanks Andrew! Any other questions from the members of the Committee or anybody? Scott do you have anything to add to that from your side?

- **Salvage**

Swearingen: So I'll just give a quick update on our salvage going on out there. We have developed some guidance for the Plan for Alternate Practices (PAP) and got that out to the field. There hasn't been specific guidance just for fire salvage recovery in addition to our regular guidance so we've also brought in some extra capacity, individuals from ODF&W and also an individual from DEQ to kind of help us with site visits and trying to coordinate with those agencies regarding salvage and they've been out in the field a couple of times already providing some assistance and some information to ODF and also the private landowner. More to come on that. We encourage the smaller landowners to reach out and we can provide guidance to them on salvage and what to do with their properties that have been burned. As far as the amount of notifications we've been getting in they have been moderating a bit. It

looks like people are starting to catch up. There was an influx especially from large industry to try to get their paperwork in and get moving on things. It seems like we have staff in place, they are starting to catch up a bit. I think that more the smaller landowner notifications are starting to come in and that will provide opportunities for folks to go out and help them a bit. So, I think that's kind of the main things that we have going on. A lot of moving parts to try and get some coordination and continuing to get guidance and that sort of thing out to our field folks. So any questions on any of that?

Barnes: I can't think of any.

Ahrens: Related to that Scott I talked with Nate Agalzoff yesterday and he was meeting with the new crew they put together for the North Cascades District which covers my Clackamas and Marion County and they were in a bit of a hurt because they only had two Stewardship Foresters by the luck of the draw instead of the five normally staffing this region right after the fire. So now they are up to speed with the extra folks that you have deployed there and we agreed that Extension would try to be the hub for the outreach. Trying to keep track of this list of folks that might need more help whether they go through ODF with the applications for forest practices or whether they call just asking basic questions of OSU or ODF. I'm going to try to coordinate with the North Cascade District for the Marion and Clackamas County folks try to keep track of all these folks, and what they are doing, what help they may need from here. Whether they want to apply for EFRP or salvage logging, reforestation, finding seedlings etc. We are trying to work together on that. And I guess I hope that can happen in the other Districts. I know going south from my counties. How well is that staffed like for the Holiday fire, the Lane and Douglas and Southwest Oregon I'm only familiar with what is happening here in the Cascades?

Swearingen: So as far as ODF staff, we were short in Douglas with some transitions there. But I think they have brought on some LD help from the DFPA to a full staff as far as Stewardship Foresters. Here in late last year we brought on a person to focus mostly on NRCS so he was in place already. So that's really helping as far as NRCS and FSA stuff goes. As far as out of our South Cascade they have brought on some extra help with their field forest officers is doing forest practices, actually Wildfire Supervisor, but anyway he is experienced with Forest Practices and at one point they brought in help from the adjoining district over in West Lane bumped across the highway to help with them. They are busy but I think they are handling that. And also as far as South Cascade goes they had two Stewardship Foresters up in Sweet Home that weren't as impacted by the fire, so they are helping with the fire recovery also.

Ahrens: One thing, with Nate as far as data sharing again. Mining the FERNS applications and trying to sort out again those on that list that might need further help. Some of them just starting salvage logging and maybe haven't gotten to the reforestation or veg management challenges they may have. What would be the best approach for me if we are trying to be a hub for aggregating the data from ODF and OSU contact the landowners? If I wanted to try to extract from the FERNS stuff and bother the local Stewardship Foresters and just have them work with me? Or whether there is maybe a reason to go to a higher level that wouldn't be on their shoulders trying to mine that FERNS data?

Swearingen: I think as far as FERNS data we could, Joe Touchstone is our FERNS guy. He may be able to help coordinate some of that. You can work through Nate and I think we could be able to do that and then it's all one system at a statewide level then we won't have to impact the districts. That would be my first thought. Being able to provide us a list of folks that have submitted notifications.

Ahrens: Nate and I agreed that at the local level here in the North Cascades with those 5 Stewardship Foresters that we would just loop ourselves together with an email network and try to get an update periodically and between that and the higher level hopefully we can fill in any gaps and try to get intel as we can.

Abraham: I might jump in here, this is Kyle. We also, one of the things we will talk about in a few minutes is our Fire Recovery Operations Team. And that group is internal to ODF but is in there looking exactly at the question you provided, trying to mine the FERNS data to better understand both what is the current extent of salvage logging and

looking for any way to help predict the gap in reforestation need over time. So they are already looking into that. And I'll touch on that somewhat...

Ahrens: That and Seed and Seedling, Reforestation Working Group I guess we want to make sure and we coordinate because we are trying to avoid duplication of effort here. So, when you touch on that maybe I can find out who the key people are and make sure that I am in the loop.

Abraham: Yeah, that sounds great.

Ahrens: Alright, thanks Kyle.

Barnes: Okay any other questions from the Committee? Well, moving along here we've got Kyle has come on and is going to talk to us about the State Structure for Post-Fire Recovery? Kyle Recovery?

9. Post-Fire Recovery/State Structure

Abraham: That sounds great it's good to see everybody. But like you all it's been a little bit hectic here at ODF. So, apologies for not participating for quite some time. And I am wondering if it is possible for me to share my screen, Susan? Do I need permission to do that? Can you guys see that? So this is, I guess what I was here to talk about a little bit is the State Structure for the wildfire recovery functions. And I'm not sure if folks have seen this, I'll be happy to send it to Susan. But really there are lots of function right now that are standing up within the last month or so. All related to recovery from the wildfires. And I'm not going to get into too much detail, because I know you guys have been talking about the extent of the fires. Particularly on the non-federal land and what that looks like statewide. But as soon as we transitioned from the fire suppression effort we were into recovery mode and really thinking about what that means for what has become the largest disaster in Oregon's history. And so for non-federal lands we are at a little over 400,000 acres within the fire perimeters just from the Labor Day event. So the more we sort of dug into it the more we understood that we did not have an organizational structure at many levels to be able to deal with the short or long term recovery efforts. So this is an highlight from the Interagency Leadership Team so the middle of your screen, which is the Natural Resource Director, State and some of the Federal Agencies, NRCS, USFS, BLM, USF&WS, EPA they are all participating in the interagency leadership for recovery. And Matt Garrett has stepped in working directly with the Governor and her team for wildfire recovery. So Matt has been a key piece that is coordinating across all these different functions and then there are two other high level groups, which are the Governor's Disaster Cabinet and Economic Recovery Council. So Peter Daugherty sits on both of those and also the Interagency Leadership Group. And they have specific tasks and places that they are looking. But clearly for ODF we are really focused on the natural and cultural resources recovery but there are so many elements to recovery generally which includes housing, infrastructure, communication, there were some schools that were lost. Repeater sites and some of these places, some of the Canyon still don't have adequate communications or cell phone service and so they are a number of things that we will need to, that are happening in recovery. And our focus really has been on the Natural and Cultural Resources Recovery Task Force. And the conveners are ODF, DEQ and OWEB. So myself, Renae Davis and Keith Anderson. So Renae is from OWEB, I think many of you probably know her. Keith Anderson is the Western Region Administrator from DEQ. We are all co-convening that Recovery Task Force in SRF 7 so for those curious about what that means, there is a State Recovery function, there are 6 other ones and then you get to 7. That are within the Office of Emergency Management. And they are a State Agency that functions for coordination both on the Emergency Service function. When we were deep in the fire suppression realm. Myself and Ryan Gordon helped with the Emergency Coordination Center and there are similar functions but really functioning on providing emergency operations and basically sort of an intrastate coordination function across of all the different services, so housing, shelters, feeding people, but where displaced with evacuations, communications, protection, all of that sort of stuff as part of the emergency services function. That now transitions to State Recovery functions that are really going to be in place for longer term investments and longer term recovery. And you probably also heard a little bit about Debris Removal Task Force. There's been several articles posted that is really for houses and other structures that have been burned and trying to remove the debris and hazard trees away from those to begin rebuilding. But clearly there's all of the homes and buildings present a certain amount of hazardous waste and nobody wants to see that get into either ground water or surface water in streams. So there's been a huge focus and that began early on

with the debris removal task force. And then the functions that are also part of the Recovery Task Force relate to assessments. And I'm not sure if Ryan or others have spoken much about the different types of assessments on federal land and BLM and there is also a group that is just now wrapping up non-federal land assessments. And they're most of those were connected as part of the FEMA recovery response. Ryan has done an amazing job coordinating all of that work and those groups are finalizing their reports and will be reporting out today and tomorrow for 4 of the major fires. So the Interagency Monitoring Research Group and there are lots of folks at different levels both to date and prior that are interested in long term monitoring questions. So some folks have been really active in there. Liz Dent will be our liaison to that interagency monitoring research group. And I think right now the thought process is that that is really a place for coordination and collaboration, rather than designing specific monitoring projects across all lands. It's an important piece that I think are given the magnitude of fires on the west side which we really hadn't seen before. There is an opportunity to do some monitoring and also an interagency recreation team which also has a connection with ODF and our State Forests Division. And then the piece that we are still trying to figure out and our Agency Directors are trying to figure out is the local fire level coordination and one of the immediate needs is the information from the assessment being delivered to the local area so that they can identify any immediate actions that they want to take to help mitigate any additional impact to infrastructure, roads, culverts, bridges, obviously any homes from debris torrents and just making sure that people are aware of all the dangers from the effects of fire on the landscape. Hazard trees, additional peak flows potentially in some of these areas, because of loss of soil holding capability. So that is kind of the State structure. I think my big takeaway that I mention to people is that to me this is really pointed at how the State is functioning in the recovery effort on a big scale. And so there are lots of boxes, lots of arrows but I think it points to how big of a deal this is for the State right now to be tackling. And having some organizational structure around it but it's a lot, there are a lot of things to do right now. So, I'll stop and see if there are any questions.

Barnes: So, Kyle coming from my work on the utility side here. We are from the public utility consumer-owned but I know that the investor-owned all of the utilities in the PNW, California, Oregon, Washington are shaking in their boots over the responsibility we have for providing power at the lowest possible costs which are extremely prone to starting fires. And we have a tremendous effort to clear right-of-ways. We spent in Douglas County in our utility almost 1 million dollars per year with crews that are constantly cutting back the brush under and around our right-of-ways but not out of our right-a-ways. So we have a number of trees, thousands of trees that we are trying to catalog them and provide a report of how many are actually outside of our right-of-way that we have no control of that have the ability to fall and crash into the wires and taking out wires, poles and starting fires. Our model has always been keep the lights on. But we are looking at these public safety power shutoffs which are really inconvenient and even deadly for people that presume that the power will be on 24/7. Anything you've heard that will help us out there?

Abraham: Not necessarily Evan, I know that conversation is happening at some level with the Governor's Council on Wildfire Response recommendations. I think that is beyond me to speak to at this point but I do know that the SRF fix that is sort of the public utilities have been spending a lot of time coordinating with ODOT on some of those tree removal and public right-a-ways, I don't know how much of that gets into the electrical component. But there are some pretty significant contracts for tree removal for safety reasons right now.

Barnes: Roadway right-a-ways right? ODOT?

Abraham: Yeah. I mean ideally it would be nice to do something similar with the power lines I would imagine.

Barnes: Yeah it involves a vast amount of cutting. Our right-a-ways are limited sometimes to 25 or 30 feet and trees that are looming over top of them 100 feet away present a problem.

Swanson: Do you think... if you could translate the riparian rules to be buffer rules to power lines, 2 tree lengths or something like that?

Barnes: And it would involve a huge amount of work if we had the permission to get them out. But we can't pay for that all with rates or otherwise people couldn't afford the power. So, unfortunately none of the fires we've seen this

year short maybe one or two were caused by power lines. We had a few grass fires in the north part of the county from our lines. But any of the fires we are talking about have all been lightning fires haven't they?

Abraham: I think they are still under investigation but...

Barnes: I've only seen some of the reports but haven't seen all of them but I guess they are still under investigation but and a lot of other causes, mostly human. But none of these like they were in 2018 caused by power lines.

Ahrens: Our local fires in Clackamas other than the Riverside were power line fires, several of them. And then Riverside was also caused in some way we assume.

Woodward: I appreciate that overview, do you have a sense of the urgent matters that ODF is filling in the response, because when I've been out on the Santiam, I think as Glenn mentioned, just getting people out like Stewardship Foresters and people to help. Unfortunately the last couple of sites that I have been on there was a logger, that really shouldn't be called a logger he had no idea about FERNS and all the practices I'm curious as to where you see the Department priorities and how you guys tackle that now?

Abraham: That's a great question Julie. I think the first piece was really to try to get those areas, like Glenn mentioned, North Cascade...to really putting our capacity from where folks were unaffected generally by fire to moving that around in the field so they can try to deal with the increase workload that they are seeing. And that is going to continue I think right now it's really focused more on forest practices. But shortly thereafter it will turn into more of the programs that Andrew was mentioning. That will need quite a bit of capacity. The other thing I think we are focused on right now is trying to get the Board of Forestry to understand how our workload has changed. Both with SB 1602 and also with the fire recovery. Trying in a realistic sense tell them all the things that we are doing, and a small piece which is actually Board policy related now. But clearly we are re-thinking a lot of our priorities, all across the Board. State Forests, Private and even some of the work in Partnership and Planning Division as well, their program. I think Julie, I don't know whether that helps or not? But everything just got flipped on its head a bit a month ago and we are still putting the pieces together a little bit.

Woodward: Yeah, absolutely. I commend you for the response this summer overwhelming to get your hands around and think about all the needs that are out there. I guess I can't comment on the Board but just certainly it felt like there is such a need and it didn't get the attention at the Board meeting of what you presented today and recognizing how much the Department and employees are really trying to help Oregonians. So, I appreciate that direction.

Abraham: And that will be a specific topic that we will spend more time on. Hopefully with new Board members in January as a specific topic. But clearly we do that usually with our October Retreat but we were still deep into the fire suppression stuff so that was not the appropriate time. When we go through our mid-course corrections with Board work plans and stuff. We are planning in January to have more of that discussion with the Board during their meeting.

Swanson: I don't want to interrupt the conversation, but I have to run to my organization's Board meeting that is happening the rest of this afternoon. I'm glad to see you all and hear these updates and sorry I will miss the conversation on our database and also outreach and SB but I'm sure I will see the notes, thanks!

Abraham: So the last thing, and I will go back to sharing my screen, I just wanted to touch a little about the internal structure I think that we are also realizing is needed. Hopefully you all can see that? Great. So internally we also realize that our capacity was pretty limited. And then we are also somewhat inefficient in how we address questions and tend to operate in certain silos across Divisions and across Programs to some degree. So we've modeled this after a little bit of what we've done in a fire support role. But really wanted to put together specific functions for recovery operations team and knowing that this will be in place for maybe a couple of years. The first role I think is going to be 3 months for the people identified here that you are seeing, but we also want, the question that Glenn and others have brought up around reforestation and seedling availability, we know that it's going to be a continuing place where we need to be coordinated and aligned across Divisions and also with external partners. So really this becomes a

clearinghouse for those sorts of questions and information that sharing and even to some degree data-mining and connecting with the field staff all the needs. A couple of the topics that they are focused on right now are salvage logging, trying to answer some questions about how much is happening, where is it happening? Are there specific public affairs messages that we would want to get out sooner rather than later? Some stories about how that becomes a recovery operation leading to reforestation and trying to get trees back on the landscape and the following question is how many trees are you going to need? So that information can also be useful there in trying to determine, what is the need? And what are some of the solutions we can work through to help with nursery capacity or education and outreach to non-industrial landowners for seedling availability and all that kind of stuff? This is clearly new for us in some ways and we are trying to think about how best to use this team, but really it's a coordinated effort. I think of it as trying to coordinate for one single question or set of questions so the team lead and have them work through the solutions rather than each Division trying to do it on their own.

Barnes: Well thanks Kyle. Any questions there? 12:00 wow!

Peel: If there is time for a quick question? I wonder Kyle is a wildlife recovery being left to ODF&W or does that somehow fall into the recreation side of ODF's plan?

Abraham: So John, I think that the fish and wildlife recovery function is going to come through the task force that I mentioned? The Natural and Cultural Resources Recovery Task Force?

Peel: Okay.

Abraham: They do already have some specific recommendations or potential options for people to think about for fish and wildlife recovery.

Peel: Good, thank you.

Abraham: Good question. Any other thoughts or questions?

Ahrens: I guess I'll just note so Adam Coble, he was on our call yesterday with the Seed and Seedling Reforestation Working Group so I think we have a connection there to coordinate that assessment and so it sounds like he is the contact for that?

Abraham: Yes he is and that's great and I think there's a number of questions that this team has put together on the reforestation and seed and seedling availability thing that would be good. You guys could ask Adam what that looks like in terms of data-mining and different ways we can identify any potential gaps or needs from the field.

Ahrens: That's good and I think Eric you are linked in with that as well now?

Hartstein: Yes, definitely.

Barnes: Okay, thanks Kyle we appreciate that and keeping us in tune in the future on your stuff. So we are up to 12:00 so 12 to 1 is lunch. We will adjourn back here at 1:00?

Gerlach: Were we going to do a shorter lunch like we have done sometimes before? I have a conflicting meeting at 2 and I would kind of hoping we would have a shorter lunch but I know we have presenters and that might not work.

Hartstein: I know both Ryan and Josh are not available till 1 so the Committee wanted to potentially look at the vacancies item I don't know if you want to do that?

Barnes: Well, what is the consensus, if we came back at 12:30 we could work on the Committee Vacancies and potentially Partner Updates to use up that ½ hour till that Josh and potentially Ryan come back, would that work for everybody?

Gerlach: Sounds good.

LUNCH

10. Committee Vacancies

Barnes: So let's start the conversation off with Committee Vacancies.

Hartstein: I can give a brief introduction if that's okay. Okay so the last CFF meeting, members requested this be a standing agenda item as there is a Landowner-At-Large position that is still vacant as well as terms expiring this coming June for Evan's Southern Oregon and John's Eastern Oregon position. There were some names brought up to potentially fill some of these vacancies as well as discussion around potentially having some overlap with the Forest Legacy and Stewardship Program Working Group formerly known as the State Stewardship Coordinating Committee to try to have an overlap with that working group and CFF. So, I'll stop there and see if there is any more discussion.

Vroman: I did get a call from Josh. We spoke a little bit about a couple of names that I've mentioned. Two of them, small woodland owners that I have been acquainted with was unable to persuade any volunteerism out of either of those people. At this point I haven't a viable name for the hat.

Gerlach: Just so I understand, the other committee the one that does Forest Legacy and so forth, is the idea that we would merge those committees or simply have some overlap in some way? Because if we merge, I would assume the members of those committees would simply become members of one committee... expanded by the merger?

Hartstein: My understanding is that the State Stewardship Coordinating Committee is now a Working Group underneath CFF. It is not an actual merger, just the structure between the two entities has changed now.

James: I participated on both and they both have uniquely different roles. I know in our conversation to link them, my perception it was more of an efficiency for the Department to work it that way. Than for the efficiency of each group that may not be correct but that was my perception.

Hartstein: Yeah, I think that is correct Jim.

Barnes: Yeah I think there was some overlap, but they do have different. But Jim do you think that they could work together on a common meeting? Or you think it is better to keep it separate?

James: I think it is better to keep it separate. Both groups have intense conversations on topics that are somewhat unrelated. And they both require a fair amount of attention of the membership, so...

Barnes: So it seems like where this was arrived at lately we were going to try a meeting together and see how it worked. But as someone who has not been re-elected but my term is ending soon and...

James: Are you eligible for another term Evan?

Barnes: No, I've had two 3 year terms. But they are going to have to take me kicking and screaming, I'm not going easy!

Gerlach: I am curious on how long the Working Group meeting tend to be to the extent that the Department has to brief these meetings? If there is overlap in the briefing format? So looking for where there is efficiency and reshuffle it to overcome some more efficiency?

James: Is Ryan on the call?

Hartstein: Ryan will be here about 1.

James: My perception is that Ryan had made the recommendation that there be some more collaboration between both and it might be best if he could explain the efficiencies that the Department saw by making this change. I was adamantly opposed to it until Ryan convinced me it was okay.

Gerlach: I could see if there was staff time taken to brief two groups to combine that, maybe that would be an efficiency but in terms of what you are pointing at Jim, they are really different conversations about very different decisions that they chose not to combine them.

James: Any completely different makeup. The Stewardship group is made up of a lot of agency folks that aren't on this group. And also it's basically designed to make a recommendation on where federal grants would go for conservation. So there are a fair number of conservation organizations that participate and actually it's really a great group of folks. There are several family woodland owners that participate and basically we help the Department to come up with recommendations on which projects in Oregon ought to move forward with federal grants for conservation. It's not real related to the work of the CFF. At least that is my perception.

Barnes: So what does this ultimately come down to? A vote by the CFF?

James: I think we already agreed that we would form a sub-committee of this group and they agreed to be a sub-committee of this group. I think that decision has already been made.

Swanson: I think so too.

Hartstein: I think the idea around the vacancy here was in order to create some efficiencies would be to potentially have somebody serving on the Forest Legacy and Stewardship Working Group, one of the landowner representatives for example might be good.

James: Barrett Brown recommended someone who's on the Stewardship Group and it's someone that is not an OSWA member and I don't know personally. But there are a couple of OSWA members that are members of that group. And I can't remember that individual's name but he might be a good choice for the Landowner-At-Large. He was also from Washington County where Barrett is located.

Dominique: That was Dan Logan.

James: Dan Logan that's right, thanks Susan.

Barnes: Well, I wonder if we could contact Barrett and see if he'll reach out to him and see if he's made a decision or, it's not, Mark that is not the same person that you were talking to?

Vroman: No I spoke with Jim Latourno, in Yamhill County landowner and then another individual, I'm not sure if he is an OSWA member or not. A fellow named Pete Kingset who is very active in forestland management. He's acquired quite a few lands over last 10 years and really is an astute individual and he said he is busy with his timberland.

James: OSWA happens to have a Board meeting tomorrow morning, it's been awhile since I made that sales pitch. I could certainly ask the Chapter presidents if they have someone that might be interested. Even I am assuming that you will find a replacement before you bow out. Is that correct?

Barnes: I've been trying!

James: Maybe I can help you.

Barnes: We haven't had in-person meetings in a while. We've had a couple, some people meet in person but I was on ZOOM the beginning of the month at a meeting and it was a short agenda and I didn't bring it up. But I have queried more than a few people to see if they are interested. I'll keep trying, I have until June, right? To figure it out?

James: You can't leave until you find a replacement!

Barnes: Yeah right! Okay.

James: Not that I have any control over that.

Gerlach: I was thinking you are a hard boss, Jim.

Barnes: And John are you still on the call? I think John started the same time I did.

Peel: I'm on ZOOM, you can't see me.

Barnes: John aren't you the same tenure as myself?

Peel: Yes. I think this is my last hurrah.

Barnes: So you heard what Jim said you can't leave until you find a replacement, how's that going?

Peel: No, I actually have a person in mind. He's a new landowner in eastern Oregon. He lives in Portland and also has forestland along the McKenzie that got destroyed along with a home and things like that but anyway living in Portland and Vida, I'm not sure he'll be living in Vida for much for a while. But I think he will be able to attend live meeting once those resume and he is a contractor in Portland but he's been involved in forest management out here with some cost-share money projects with ODF and so I think he will become more of an active forest manager and think he would learn a lot from the Committee and ultimately I think he could bring some east side wisdom and reports to the Committee.

His name is Bob Pfeiffer and I can ask him if you would like.

Barnes: That would be great. The biggest ambassador to the Committee is from an existing member to a new member. I think it is a good transition. Mike Barnes called me up one day and said, hey if you want to go to Salem tomorrow, and I said yeah. And here I am 6 years later.

Peel: And you can't leave! Okay I'll talk to Bob. He would start in September, at the first meeting in September then?

Barnes: Yeah, that is pretty consistent that the July meeting is called for fire season. I think it is. Eric is there anyone else that is turning over?

Hartstein: No, it's you and John.

Barnes: Before I leave I will definitely take the ride on Marine One around town before I go! Okay, and then the At-Large, there could be some potential shifting of designations to fill that too as well? Is that how we came up with a possible plan?

Hartstein: I believe so. Move some people around.

Barnes: Okay, and since we have a little bit of time, before we hear from Ryan or Josh, Partner Updates, what do we have there Eric?

Hartstein: This is really an opportunity for committee members or other partners on the call to provide any updates that are important to their agencies or organizations that they represent.

11. Partner Updates

James: I would talk about OSWA and the Oregon Tree Farm System who are members of the Partnership for Forestry Education have been collaborating with EcoTrust to develop what they call, LandMapper and its going to be a mapping tool. My perception is that if you type in your address and it brings you to that general area in a large landscape and all the parcels are identified. And you have to pick out which parcel is yours once you tap that parcel you get a series of maps and a lot of information about your forestland. And it's designed to help people develop forest management plans. It also is a way to gather a lot of information about your property. It includes soil maps, stream layers, it has the ODF stream layers on it, contour maps, aerial photo, and a vicinity map. Anyway there's going to be a webinar on December 8th where LandMapper will be exposed to everyone. Is Glenn back on the line? He is probably smarter than I on how to access it. It's an OSU Extension webinar. It's from 3 to 4:30 on December 8th.

Woodward: Hey, Jim I can send everyone the registration link. If you want or maybe to let people know if they go to the KnowYourForest.org there's a whole page on the Tree School Online and you can register for any of them there. We have about 30 that are recorded on that page if you want to go back and look at any. And we've had close to 9000 people that have attended Tree School Webinars. So they've been a good way for us to get out. Our one on Tuesday had over 300 people registered. They are starting to have a good amount of people. So thanks Jim I am looking forward with that one on its reveal.

Gerlach: That's a great thing to bring up. One of the things that when I was working with US Forest Capital it became so clear that smaller groups even with consulting it's so hard to have the GIS staff on your staff to do feasibility projects. So like that first level, how do you take a look and see if you might do this management or that management, and put carbon on top of it. If you have this tool it would be wonderful to get people over that threshold.

James: And this is the first step. We are working with EcoTrust to in the future add ODF&Ws conservation strategy information. And so some other bells and whistles so the goal would be that the landowner could find out the tremendous amount of information about their property that they might not have known.

Gerlach: I hear about this from the Carbon Offset Project. Like to finance carbon for instance. And people are trying to find ways to help landowners with smaller areas to consolidate their holdings, and this could be a tool for that for doing the analysis necessary so you can consolidate for voluntary carbon project.

James: Someway to help identify the characteristics in the forest types that are there based on tree heights and a bunch of other information I don't understand. I don't know whether that would be a lot of good information for a landowner to know.

Barnes: So that's a web-based software? Is that what it is?

James: Yes, that is my understanding.

Barnes: That sounds great, you have that link that you could send to us? That would be excellent, it sounds interesting.

Woodward: Yeah I will do it.

James: I might as well throw in that at OSWA's Annual Meeting next July in Springfield we are going to spend a day going through LandMapper and helping forestland owners write forest management plans. July 22 to the 24th Springfield. Put it on your calendar!

Barnes: We'll pencil it in as a maybe, huh?

James: Yeah, that's assuming that we can have it.

Barnes: Okay, Partner Updates, anyone else has to add to that discussion?

Geddes: I can give just a brief update. So my areas of Stewardship for the Region and also the Forest Legacy Program. The focus lately has been on Forest Legacy and you guys just touched on it briefly but Oregon has 3 projects that they have submitted. The Western States have gone through them and ranked them for them. There was 19 projects in the Western States total and I will be working next week with the Washington Office on a very very small team of representative across the country and we just reviewed all 47 of the projects nationally and generated the rankings, and going into a giant bucket to come out and we will start talking about them next week. And Oregon has 3 projects another round of funding for Arch Cape on the coast. The 4th Phase of Hood River Fish & Forest we call it about 20,000 acres total. And there is a 3rd one is Spence Mountain down on the western shore of Klamath Lake. Its Spence Mountain's first appearance and Arch Cape has been through a round of funding already and hopefully for additional money for FY21 but of course we don't have our budget yet! So they submitted for FY22 just to cover the basics and Hood River Fish & Forest is in their 4th phase with hopefully getting a 3rd phase of funding in 21. And the only other thing is the Great American Outdoor Act that was passed and we will have a big influence on that program. I'm not sure exactly what yet. But we have a guaranteed source of funding but we don't know how much. It has to go to the appropriators every year still. The money has always been there but with the passage of that now we will get money. And the LWCF, Land and Water Conservation Fund will be funded annually. So that's all the big news, it affects public lands everywhere and there will be more to come on that.

Peel: What was the first project you mentioned of the three?

Geddes: Arch Cape. It was put forth by the Arch Cape Water District is the partner with the State. And Hood River...

Gerlach: It's the North Coast Conservancy together with the Water District right?

Geddes: Yes.

Peel: Good. Thank you.

Geddes: And I should just mention that two of those are fee title which would be Arch Cape and Spence Mountain. And the Hood River project is a conservation easement. And that is all Weyerhaeuser land. So that's it from the Forest Legacy standpoint and the only other thing from the Forest Service is of course we don't have our budget. The Continuing Resolution is through the 11th of December. You know, there are some probably more in touch with what's happening on the Hill. Of course we are hoping for an Omnibus if that is the best we can get without getting a budget. So who knows what is going to happen? I would anticipate that there won't be a shut down but I hope not. I've become a little gun-shy now but anyway once our budget comes through then the money starts coming through. But the sooner we can get it the sooner we can get it to the States. But every year is always something different, and when there is a change in the Administration that always becomes even more... it just depends, you just never know. So that's it.

Gerlach: Do you see an aspect for the matching funds that may come from the State of Oregon for those projects, do you see a bottleneck there? For increased federal funds? But not just Oregon funds?

Geddes: Yeah, I think, I mean personally I think if there are going to be some challenges on that Great American Outdoor Act side, if there is more money in the pipeline with a lot of pressure to get projects on the ground right? Because they have passed this amazing thing. And you know, and you've been in the non-profit business a long time, I think it will take a few years to get here. I think it is going to go through some... it's going to be hard and you can only put forward so many projects and they still have to be good projects. And I think it will take a few years before we really know what that's going to look like. But we are not the only State in that position from. The deal with the money, with the projects anyway we get a lot of pressure from Washington is that projects need to be really close to ready when the funding comes through. It shouldn't be a 4 or 5 year process of negotiations and everything so you know "we", and I'm going to talk collectively, nationally, a little behind but if a lot of work starts bringing really good projects that are more cooked. It will still probably take a while but hopefully in a few years that bottleneck will break either from the non-profit or the State side or we'll figure out new ways to do business. There are a lot of unknowns. And I'm pretty much only a year and just over a year in the program. So it's been a fast ride! But you are absolutely right. There are some challenges. And especially because the State has limited funding with OWEB not avoiding anything and we had some hopes for that, but I think that these things eventually kind of work themselves out. Good projects will continue to come forward, good projects will get funding and good projects will happen on the ground. It will be super-interesting to see how the Great American Outdoor Act will play out. I think this next year FY21 this fiscal year we are in right now we'll just be learning more about it and there's been a lot of asks to provide information. Because we are also limited in our capacity. So we have issues on our side of the ledger like appraisal work, and all that kind of stuff. So there are a few things in play. Anyway that's it!

Barnes: Okay, Janelle thank you for that. We are just about at 1 o'clock so we could be expecting, okay we are looking for Ryan or Josh will come later. I guess we'll see if he is going to show up here huh? There's Josh.

Hartstein: Ryan's meeting is running late. So maybe switch and have Josh?

Barnes: You're here Josh, you're up we are waiting for you.

12. SB 1602 Update

Barnard: So, given that not everybody was available last time. I'll give a little bit of brief background on SB1602. And then I only have a few updates as we discussed this last time. So, the connect the dots for everybody, when I refer to Senate Bill 1602 it's really the legislative implementation of the MOU between the Timber and Conservation Groups that was announced by the Governor's Office back in February. The first attempt was trying to move that through the legislation in that Short Session and that did not happen. But it was put forth in the June 2020 Special Session and the legislature did take action on it. So it put several pieces in motion. I'll primarily focus on the internal stuff. But it also has an external component that sets up a timeframe for further mediated sessions facilitated through the Governor's Office to have a mediator facilitate those sessions. And they set that group up with some funding to do that as well. How I would break this out is the first piece which was relevant to our conversation this morning is, Senate Bill 1602 did direct the BOF to adopt the SSBT rules in the Siskiyou georegion. So, we started moving forward on that rather quickly, it has a deadline of January 1st, 2021. So, we are well underway on that we've conducted all the public comment, public hearing and the Board has approved the final rule language. So, those rules are set to go into place on January 1st. We do plan to hold SSBT training that will be online only given the COVID environment on December 10th at 11:00 am on those rules. The second piece of new requirements that this legislation puts in place are new buffer requirements for pesticide applications via helicopter. Those rules also go into effect on January 1st 2021 and everything that is needed to implement those rules is in statute. So, there is no rulemaking needed by the Department or the Board of Forestry, the statute will just stand and be effective January 1st. The third piece which is where I was at over lunch break, is the bill also directs us to modify the FERNS system to be able to provide next day announcements to nearby residents and water users of pesticide applications via helicopter. This will be new functionality in FERNS. Essentially we need to set up a mobile platform that operators can notify that they plan to spray by 7 pm the day before. And anyone living within 1 mile or has a water use within 1 mile will qualify to receive those notices. So, we've also got that process up and rolling at least in terms of building that system. Maybe I'll just start there, that is the high level piece, and I'll stop and see if people have questions. I talked through a fair bit of that last time as well.

Vroman: So Josh are those 'registered' water users that govern that part?

Barnard: It is any water use that meets the beneficial use defined in the bill. It can be registered or not. They just have to have sufficient evidence that they are using it for some form of domestic use, a garden, lawn, some acre thresholds, livestock, and domestic use in the residence. If they can, whether it's registered or not they can do that. There is a step in the Bill that instructs us to coordinate with OWRD to pull in the 'point of diversion' information that they maintain which would be the registered water rights. There is a clause there where it directs us to work with OWRD there is the recognition that their data, not all data is very specific as to where it sits on the landscape. Some are only identified down to the quarter section or there are other issues when a water right can be moved up or down a certain distance without having to re-file for that. So, it directs us to work with OWRD to determine what is accurate enough in their data currently to adopt and bring into the system for the protection measures as well.

Barnes: So it would be incumbent upon the person applying whatever aerial spraying to search these out prior to their application?

Barnard: So the way it is actually set up we did get funding for an additional permanent staff person. And so one to receive the notices, somebody has to reach out to us to register for that, to say they are interested. Just like someone subscribes in FERNs these days. And then somebody who has one of these unregistered water sources is going to need to identify that obviously by signing up to the notice and we will add it to a GIS layer where it will then be able to receive that protection. The ones that we will know about are the ones that we can bring in from OWRD that are accurate enough at this point. There will be further work, OWRD is required to report back to the legislature characterizing the data we were able to use and the data we weren't able to use. And there will probably be further efforts to refine that so that all the data is useable.

Barnes: Okay, sounds pretty good.

Barnard: I have heard, and others are probably in the loop more than I am, that the effort to move forward with the mediated sessions is getting traction, not to put you on the spot Jim, but I don't know if they have gotten to the first meeting yet or not?

James: Yeah, the first meeting has not happened yet. It is predicted to happen before too long, but again I am limited to what can officially say, I don't think I have violated my oath of silence, yet. But I will say that it is still underway. Both parties are still committed to meet the obligations of the MOU. And they are working with the Governor's office to get things rolling.

Barnes: So Jim I know we talked when that first came out and I had transferred a couple of people that were pretty upset about it to you. How would you say the consumption of that is now among everybody?

James: I have not heard from a lot of folks who are opposed to the conversation. I think the rubber will hit the road when we come up to what we might agree on, but I am cautiously optimistic that both sides are dedicated to find solutions that work for both sides. And so one of the goals of the MOU is to get 'federal protection' but basically a HCP for private forestlands related to riparian T&E species. And one of the other commitments is that we would follow science in that conclusion. And the other thing is that we would have a healthy wood products industry at the conclusion of this effort. Those are commitments that are in the MOU and at this point in time I have no reason to believe both sides won't work towards those ends.

Barnes: So you mentioned a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) when Endangered Species are discovered? Is that what it is?

James: The HCP would be for the species that are listed now, and then also it will expand to potential T&E species all riparian related. It is not an upland T&E species but just the riparian areas endangered species. And with the HCP then

private landowners would have an incidental take permit which as long as they comply with the HCP requirements they would not be vulnerable to taking of a T&E species.

Barnes: Yeah, I'm curious Mark, have you read through that thing? And are you keeping tabs on that?

Vroman: I'm not specifically involved in it. I would suspect our legal council is sitting in those meetings that Jim is referencing. But I'm not sure who all is in there.

James: He is.

Vroman: I thought so. So, I keep an ear to his conversation but I haven't been tracking it real close.

Gerlach: I was going to say, a little thing, that there is an HCP and then another thing and then the Healthy Wood Products Industry? What was the other thing?

James: We agreed that we would follow science in determining what the actions need to be. That was my convincing element to proceed. We've always had battling science and we've agreed to collectively come up to identify what the 'real' science is. And prior to this that has not been something that the landowner community or the environmental community have ever been able to do. In my opinion.

Barnes: Josh, excuse me, what else do you have on that? Any more, continuing?

Barnard: I think I mentioned that we will hold the training on December 10th it will be online for anyone in the Siskiyou region or otherwise interested in SSBT rules. Most folks on the west side may have already been through that and dealing with it for a couple of years, but on that same day in the afternoon at 2pm we will be offering online training regarding the new pesticide application buffers. And that information, if it hasn't been dispersed, will start getting dispersed here soon in terms of how to connect and join that training, but it all will be in a virtual environment given the COVID situation.

Barnes: Okay, so what else to we have to talk about? Maybe Ryan has been held over in his meeting a little bit?

James: Ryan set up a meeting with Kaola and me. I think there were a few others on the call. And we talked about outreach to family woodland owners for a variety of reasons and there is a database that all the members of the Partnership for Forestry Education have access to and so the Partnership for Forestry Education plans to invite Sustainable NW to be part of that educational group. Which then would give them access to that database. And it's one that's updated, several counties are updated every year but it's a list of all the county folks that have forestland. But ownership changes a lot so it's never perfect. And we try and update it every 5 years. And so, the other thing we talked about was the EcoTrust LandMapper Project that we have. Is currently, all it does is identify all the parcels. So when you access the big picture there you have to be smart enough to know where your parcel is. The roads are all identified, it should be relatively easy to do. But we did talk about maybe sometime down the road we could expand that to include names of the landowners. And again that would then provide a tremendous amount of information about outreach efforts for example. If you wanted to reach out to a group of landowners who have certain characteristics you'd be able to identify that. That's some of the other conversations we had looking down the road. So that is my recollection of the call that we had. And Ryan might have a more detailed description, but that is my perception about what we did. We agreed that Sustainable NW should be added to the Partnership for Forestry Education. I believe that is underway. And then we talked about how we collaboratively should work together to make the system that we have better.

Barnes: Is that the way you remember it Josh? Anything to add?

Barnard: That's it pretty much in a nutshell. Sorry I am still eating my lunch.

Barnes: Okay, so we have covered most everything in the agenda. Susan, did you come up with anything on the other minutes that hadn't been approved?

Dominique: Yes, that was the May minutes. It would have been in the packet from the last meeting. If you look in the minutes from the last meeting, it says we didn't get the chance to approve those other minutes.

Barnes: Do we have in attendance a quorum of the Committee?

Gerlach: I don't think you can count me, I wasn't there so I have to not vote.

Dominique: We've got 4 regular voting members.

Barnes: So, four, okay. What's required for a quorum?

Dominique: Four.

Barnes: So from one of the qualifying members is there a Motion to Approve the May minutes.

Peel: I would make that Motion, yes. We have never had a set of minutes that have not been approved. A few changes, but at this point I think we should approve the May minutes.

Barnes: Okay, so Motioned and is there a Second?

Vroman: Second.

Barnes: All those in favor, say aye. Opposed? Okay they are approved. Okay, let's see what else we have here.

Peel: When is our next meeting?

James: I've got December 10th on my calendar.

Dominique: December 10th.

Barnes: At 9 am? Same place?

Dominique: And we moved forward into next year's calendar dates. They should all appear in the minutes you got today from the last meeting.

Peel: Okay, I'll need to look at those, thank you.

Barnes: Ryan, how did you do in your other meeting?

Gordon: Well, since I last joined you we have done presentations for Holiday Farm and the Beachie Fires and aside from both being too long I think they went really well. So, three down, one to go tomorrow morning.

Ahrens: Hey, Ryan. What's the outreach plan for communicating the significant results and landowner, what people need to know about the ETART results? The safety hazards, landslide hazards, flood hazards, that kind of stuff?

Gordon: We've gotten at least four community stakeholder meetings. Three of which just occurred today. The fourth one for the Archie Fire is tomorrow. Those have all been recorded or will be recorded and made available online. And those are the preliminary results while we have the Federal teams here. Those folks their mission assignment ends on Saturday. So a lot of them are departing. The final reports with all the supporting documentation and maps etc. will

probably be available the week after Thanksgiving. Just as things go and from there we are currently working trying to establish a clearinghouse where we would have some public-facing information and the real value for most of the agencies involved in the recovery is in all the data that has been collected in the GIS products, etc. That can be used for additional analysis and so we are still looking for an opportunity to host that and try to make it available. I know Kyle was on earlier and talked about the State recovery functions. So there is that assessment sub-group and that group is going to be the primary point of contact for continued work with the assessment data and continued outreach around it. Whatever that winds up looking like. The other thing that I would mention is that there is a funding group as well. That has been looking at, so first of all the Assessment group, I hope I am not duplicating what Kyle said, but that assessment group is going to be doing an prioritization process, so taking the ETART data and taking a look across the landscape and trying to prioritize the greatest needs so that we can tackle those first and match them up with funding opportunities. So the focus of that effort is really on life and safety. Followed by some of the resource impacts. But it's not an ownership by ownership evaluation. So, we're going to have to, in terms of specifically helping individual landowners, it is a dataset that is available to us to make use of as we are looking to help them create plans and other things to help them out. Super long winded answer to your question!

Ahrens: Drawing out some of the next steps and outreach related stuff of course.

Barnes: Alright. Can you tell us about landowner outreach?

Gordon: The Landowner Database. Did you guys already talk about that a little bit?

James: I gave them a summary. My recollection of the call we had Ryan, with Kaola.

Gordon: Okay. I don't know that I have a lot more to add there. I think that's a product that ODF has been a partner in creating but it is owned by Family Forests in Oregon. And Jim, I think I had to leave that meeting as well before it concluded?

James: That's right you did!

Gordon: Probably for the same reasons here today! But my recollection was that you guys were working on a strategy to move forward with that database.

James: And that's correct. And OFRI has provided a grant for us to update 6 counties this year. And we do have a contract with someone to do that. And my perception is that it is underway. Jeremy Felty has been coordinating that for me so, my accurate details are a little bit vague. But it is in play and that system is still available for the members of the Partnership for Forestry Education to use for outreach to family woodland owners.

Felty: As Jim said it has a continuous grant every year from OFRI to at least keep the lights on as well as doing a couple of county updates. It's been pretty slow lately on that front but I'd like to see it moving again. So I'm glad that small group could meet before.

Ahrens: Jeremy, there was a fine-tuning of that where there was an overlay of the actual occurrence of trees and forests with tax lots, so beyond just the forest tax classification. Is this something still going on in these updates with the counties? Are they taking that not just the 600 property class but anyone who has trees overlapping with the tax lot greater than 5 acres or whatever?

Felty: Great question! I don't think so. I think that has kind of fallen down on the list as a priority. More the priority now is just updating those same properties. When I use the list I do use... total acres? And there are in my eyes significant discrepancies. When you are trying to mail a letter let's say to all landowners in Yamhill that own a minimum of 40 forested acres and none of them own, no one in the county according to the database owns 40 forested acres. They may own 40 acres but according to the database. It needs a lot of work. I think it would be good for the

partnership group to have some further discussion about that potentially. I think there is a funding ask there to get the program really going again. So, I'll have to bring it up at the next Partnership meeting.

Ahrens: I just know in general there are a lot of counties where the forest property tax class doesn't capture all the forest owners because a lot of them are Ag or ranch or range or even small tracts. And for instance in Marion County that layer increased the forest owner database from about 1000 to 2500 landowners with trees because so many farmers in Marion County have lots of trees. So that is an example. So that is important if we can beef that up someday and get funding to do that right. We'd get a lot more forest landowners that way.

Felty: I totally agree.

Ahrens: A lot of the ones not seeing themselves as forestland owners have all the more need to get up to date when they do suddenly turn their eyes to their forests.

Woodward: Jim, if you would put OFRI in that conversation on the database, maybe before the partnership meeting? Because we may have funds if it is related to helping contact people after the fire this might be an opportunity to get a big bump to get some of updates we need to do. So I would like to talk about that as soon as we are starting to go through a budget process. But I think maybe there are some funds available if we see a need that would help in contacting landowners sooner than later, with after fire needs we could maybe make a case for that.

Ahrens: Absolutely Julie. Let's chat soon.

Woodward: Okay.

Gordon: And Julie I know you left me a message last night, sorry I didn't get back to you. As you have heard I am not back to my 'day job' just yet! I'm working on it. Also a couple of notes on the database. That spatial analysis that was done to identify forested acres was pretty costly. So just want to flag that. And also I think everyone knows that one of the biggest challenges with the database to date is that it's not a spatial database, it's tabular. So it's pretty challenging to for instance, intersect the fire area polygons and target just those landowners who fall within that polygon. Its most easily sorted county by county. It's not to say that you couldn't do that intersection but it takes a fair amount of manipulation and GIS technical expertise that I certainly don't have.

Barnes: We've got 1:30 here. Are there any other things that we haven't covered?

Woodward: I guess I can give a quick OFRI update before we sign off. We have been working on an updating of Establishing Forest Trees in Western Oregon. The publication that we send to people doing tree seedlings and a lot of the push with OSWA and others when they do their tree seedling sales. So that is going to be coming out. And as Jim mentioned the Tree School Online webinars. One of them will be on Reforestation, Steve Fitzgerald. So we are working hard as people are thinking about reforestation helping them get that data and information on reforestation. The other project I thought I would mention I'm working with ODF on in NW Oregon corner is a project that began before the fire started but one of the things always of concern is slash pile burning which right now a big is...happening in the field right now. So we are working with ODF on kind of a best practices guide for that and a video that will come out. And I think this group, that will be of interest, another project on the fire discussion that we had, because we see a lot of utilizing that to help clean up and especially after the fire a lot of slash piling and burning. So trying to get out good information.

James: On that I assume that you are taking advantage of the new Smoke Management Rules that allow covering piles? That new tool is significant particularly for family woodland owners to burn piles. They can cover them and they can get a really quick burn. And it would help them out in areas where smoke is an issue they can burn on a rainy day if the pile is dry. I hope you include something like that.

Woodward: Yeah, we are working with Mike Cafferata and Rodney Jacobs up at the NW Forest Protection Association is a big part of it and that is part of the message they are trying to help get out and before obviously the Labor Day fires one of the things we saw for a lot of the private lands this was the biggest liabilities was the burning of piles. So they wanted some best practices to address that.

Barnes: Any other closing thoughts? Eric is he still around?

Hartstein: I'm here.

Barnes: Anything we have not covered that you think we need to talk about?

Hartstein: I think we covered, you all covered the agenda quite nicely. Thank you.

Barnes: Okay, well unless there is anything else, school is out!

Meeting Adjourned.