



Eastern Oregon Regional Forest Practices Committee Meeting Minutes for May 16, 2018

Pursuant to public notice made by news release with statewide distribution, a committee meeting with members of the Eastern Oregon Regional Forest Practices Committees [an advisory body to the Oregon Board of Forestry with authority established in Oregon Revised Statute 527.650] was hosted on May 16, 2018 at the Sunriver Resort, Sunriver, Oregon.

Committee Members present:	Committee Members not attending
Bob Messinger, Chairman Joe Justice, Hancock Forest Management, LaGrande Chris Johnson, Whitefish Cascade Forest Resources Lee Fledderjohann, Collins Pine Company, Lakeview Ed Fallon, Green Diamond, Klamath Falls	Elwayne Henderson, Henderson Logging Stan Benson, Public Representative Irene Jerome, NR Consultants, John Day Paul Jones, Wyeast Timber Services
ODF Staff attending:	Guests:
Kyle Abraham, Private Forests Deputy Chief Marganne Allen, Forest Health & Monitoring Mgr. Lena Tucker, Private Forests Division Chief Ryan Gordon, Family Forestlands Coordinator Janet Stevens, Private Forest Division Office Support Keith Baldwin, FPA Field Coordinator, Private Forests Adam Coble, Monitoring Specialist, Private Forests Ariel Cowan, Monitoring Specialist, Private Forests Josh Barnard, Field Support Manager Terry Freuh, Monitoring Coordinator Nate Agalzoff, Incentives Coordinator (Acting) John Hawksworth, Monitoring Specialist Nick Hennemann, Public Affairs Danny Norlander, Forest Health Survey and Monitoring Specialist Steve Kendall, Stewardship Forester, Sweet Home Paul Clements, Training and Monitoring Coordinator Kristin Dodd, Unit Forester, The Dalles Travis Medema, EOA Director	Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers Seth Barnes, OFIC

1. Welcome and Introductions – Bob Messinger, Chair

The Chair welcomed the members and noted some had participated in the Private Forests Conference. He then asked for roundtable introductions.

- Approval of the Minutes

Messinger asked for a Motion to Approve the Minutes from the December 12, 2017 meeting. Fledderjohann so moved to approve as written. The motion was seconded. All were in favor. Minutes were approved.

- Public Comment

There was no comment offered.

2. Private Forests and Agency Update – Kyle Abraham/Lena Tucker

Abraham began by thanking Chris Johnson, Lee Fledderjohann and Joe Justice for participating in our Private Forests Conference. The agenda included a really good panel of speakers talking about their different companies, their goals, their missions, sort of the organizational structure of their companies and how they function and value the relationships with Stewardship Foresters. The majority of the Stewardship Foresters statewide were able to attend. There were over 100 people at the conference. He wanted to extend another round of thanks for all the effort to make that happen!

Reporting on Program staffing, when the Committee last met we were in the midst of recruitment for Stewardship Forester positions. The good news is we are up to capacity in Stewardship Foresters across the State. Staff conducted a couple of trainings and orientation sessions with those folks in January and February. Paul Clements brought the new hires to a Board meeting in January to expose them to how the Board functions and some of the history and statutes and different things that drive our Agency and Division. There are other training topics in the works some of those high profile things that can take a lot of careful coordination. There were changes to the Private Forests administrative staff because of two retirements. Janet Stevens is new in the Office Specialist position. We also have a new Civil Penalties person, Brooke Burgess who is coming behind retired Linda Price. At the time of the meeting Abraham was still going through the recruitment process for the Water Quality Specialist. And Marganne Allen has a vacant NRS1 position that we will be recruiting for. In terms of some changes with the Governor's Natural Resource Office, Lauri Aunan, who we worked quite a bit with Private Forests in terms of legislative coordination has moved on to a position with DEQ as their Implementation Manager so the Governor's Office is actively recruiting for another NR Advisor at this point.

He mentioned one of the projects that he wanted to bring to the member's attention was a some work that we have been doing with DEQ and ODA and a few other agencies around pesticide monitoring. And we are getting pretty close to having a final report that all the agencies have signed onto in terms of some of the results we've seen from the forestry perspective. This work was studying levels of pesticide residue in Waters of the State for different land uses. It will be reporting out pesticide detections and levels of risk. The report will tell a pretty good message for forestry. The results aligns really well with the other studies that we've done or that we've seen that are specifically focused on forestland. The message is that there *are* detections of pesticides but they are at very low concentrations, and at a very low frequency. The way we are evaluating that is based upon a Pesticide Management Plan that was approved by the EPA. Agencies are all looking at the same baseline information and context in terms of presenting that information. Forestry is in the low risk category when categorizing risk to aquatic life. So he considers that a positive story for forestlands. When the report is completed he asked members to think about ways we could share that information telling it in a fair, non-biased manner.

Tucker then updated members on the Board of Forestry vacancies. The Board was down 2 members at the time of the meeting. Gary Springer's position has been vacant two years now. Sybil Ackerman-Munson announced at the last Board meeting in April that it was her last meeting. So we are down two. She heard that Tom Insko has been appointed to the Economic Development Commission, so he's been appointed elsewhere and June will be his last meeting. Then the Board will be down three members. Nominations are supposed to go through the Senate Legislative Days so the next time they will be doing Boards and Commissions Appointments would be on September Legislative Days. So the Department will get three new Board members we'll have to get oriented. She was certain there are good candidates out there that are interested in serving on the Board.

The next BOF meeting will be in LaGrande on June the 6th. That will be followed by a CLT Mass Timber Conference/Workshop. Nils Christoffersen and Tom Insko have been engaged in that. The June Board meeting is typically when they vote on approval of fire protection budgets. The agenda will probably include some business with Protection Associations and the first detailed discussion with the Board on the Agency Strategic Initiative. Tucker gave the group details on the Agency Initiative which is part of this biennial budgeting process. Typically, each Division/Program looks at areas needing added capacity or funding for projects. But this go round, our State Forester, challenged the Exec staff to think of Agency needs across Divisions under some unifying theme. Staff came up with some overarching problem statements that really fit what the Agency is facing. They recognized that Oregon is experiencing increased severity, complexity and duration of our fire seasons. As all programs provide overhead for the Incident Management Teams during fire season managers had to identify the impact of the Agency's response to that workload and what affect that has had on the core business of the Agency. When we lose our summers to long fire seasons our core business processes are set aside for the fire emergencies, making it unavoidable with current capacity to keep caught up with core business. So capacity funding is really a big part of the Agency Initiative. How do we as an Agency sustain our core business? Divisions have combined together to create one initiative ask for a total of 55 FTE (additional people) amounting to \$25.4 million as a total request, 100% General Fund. The State

Forester, Peter Daugherty, Fire Division Chief, Doug Grafe have been assigned this special initiative for the Agency and are including stakeholders to help shape this request. The Board has to give their final approval on our Agency Request Budget in July. From there it goes in downtown by the end of August. Then we wait to see what shows up in the Governor's Budget which is usually the first week of December. But if there is a new Governor, that recommended budget won't be available until February. From there it goes to the Legislative Session. Private Forests is looking to add 12 more boots on the ground. For additional Stewardship Foresters that are working within the Urban/Wildland interface and for a geotech and a roads specialist in Salem. Funding for training is included in the ask as well because it takes a long time for folks to get through the ranks of fire training to achieve some of the higher level positions on the teams. So that is an important consideration to the succession management planning efforts, when folks with lots of experience retire we need to be constantly building experience behind them. We are attracting new and younger talent into the agency and need to get them trained. Opportunities like the Conference helps orient new Stewardship Foresters to who they are working with, who their neighbors are and what the Agency mission is.

She provided a west side update that the Board of Forestry is engaged in a rule analysis project to look at the Marbled Murrelet. The Board has an obligation through statute that they are supposed to create rules for species that are Threatened or Endangered either on a Federal or State list. They received a petition to do so a couple of years ago. BOF reviewed the petition at that time but although that effort was on their work plan they made a decision not to begin the work at that time as we had just finished the Riparian Rulemaking and we were trying to get some other work items accomplished before we launched into another potentially tough topic. Then the same conservation groups put together another petition to sue the Board because they were ignoring their statutory obligation. So the Board asked the Department to move ahead with rule analysis. Currently we have a draft Technical Report about the biology of the species and identifying some of the key questions that the Board will eventually have to discuss. Like, what is the resource site? What does the bird need? So the technical report details all of information provided in the science and literature about the Murrelet. The Board gave staff approval to move forward now with an Expert review of the report that will ensure we have the best information available to present the Board for their decision-making.

Some other work going on for the Board, is some decision-making regarding the State Forest Management Plan but the last Board meeting took over 2 hours of public comment on the Plan but wasn't able to get to some of the decision-making that was needed to move forward. In other news, the Elliot Forest is still kind of in caretaker mode. Still in public ownership under DSL and they have contracted out the basic maintenance of the forest. ODF no longer manages the Elliot. But it is still in public ownership.

Abraham turned the presentation over to Josh Barnard for a discussion on Tethered Logging noting there was some interest from RFPC members in how it was evolving on the west side and what the opportunities may be in the future for east side landowners.

3. Tethered Logging – Josh Barnard, Field Support Manager

Barnard began by noting that this new technology has seen an uptick of use on the west side. Staff are working on evaluating these tethered logging systems against the Forest Practices Act. He showed members some slides of what tethered logging configurations look like on the ground. The first slide had a picture of a tail hold machine sitting up on the road with a feller/buncher machine down the fairly steep slope as typical of what we are referring to when we are talking about cable-assist or tethered logging.

He showed a couple more images of the different types of equipment configurations. Cut-to-length configurations as well as the feller/buncher shovel types. Each one has a little bit different outcome or impact on the landscape. About a year ago, there were some conversations that started to happen around operations that were potentially going to occur on High Landslide Hazard slopes, which triggered a quick review for us in Salem trying to figure out how this fit in. There is quite a bit of different language around ground-based harvesting on our 60+% slopes, and as you get into HLHL slopes.

This review of new systems will also apply on the east side. The rules we are evaluating against are in 629-630-0150 on Ground-based Harvesting where it talks about steep slopes over 60% and erosion-prone slopes

at 40%. That's one rule set that governs those upper reaches of those slopes and the other one, based on the west side, we have our Harvesting on High Landslide Hazard Locations. The primary one with eastside focus is the rule set for Ground-based Harvesting on steep slopes to reduce the potential for erosion from steeper or erosion-prone slopes to enter Waters of the State. Looking at that rule set, it uses a lot of conventional logging terminology which obviously doesn't fit the current technology. It refers to skid trails, and those sorts of things. What the big trigger here is, where it says, if skid trails are located on these steep and erosion-prone slopes operators shall locate them at least 100' from any stream channel. So that's the one limiting factor we see as far as tethered logging, it does use the term skid trail, but that was probably put into rule set to help contain that disturbance within 100' feet of a stream channel. If you do have tethered logging on those types of slopes we're asking for a Plan for Alternate Practice so that the operator can describe what they are going to do in that area to prevent sediment from entering Waters of the State. And the rest of the rule set applies. Skid trails should not be located straight up and down steep, erosion-prone slopes for a distance exceeding 100 feet unless effect drainage and sediment filtration can be achieved. All those would still apply. Number 9 talks about operators shall limit the amount of ground so that disturbed soils to no more than 10%. And done correctly, tethered logging can achieve those outcomes, from what we have seen on the landscape. HLHL rules, the purpose of those rules are to prevent timber harvesting in a way that causes serious ground disturbance and drainage alterations.

A Plan for Alternate Practice typically describes what rule the operation is deviating from; in this case it should refer to that 0150 rule set and looking to modify probably that subsection (5) Plans require stating what measures will be taken to show that the operation will give the same results or better than the current FPA rule. It does require approval by the Department, typically your local Stewardship Forester. It is actual approval of the document, so the Department has a little skin in the game when we give approval. Also, important to know, they have developed a template to show what information a Stewardship Forester is looking for to help make that decision. But a landowner can submit their own template or form that answers all those questions as well.

A member asked if OROSHA has approved these systems. The response was that there are 19 waivers out there right now. As this equipment is not officially stamped from the factory to operate on those slopes. (Although it comes with the capability with the winches on there.) So, they are having to go through an exception/waiver process with OSHA for those feller/buncher types of equipment. But he shared that the stuff that Miller Timber is using, or at least the site that he saw, the Ponzi equipment being used is actually rated for that slope and so they do not have to go through that process.

Others on the east side are trying to get at the scale of it, the amount of wood, the amount of volume is difficult because of the capital investment involved is tremendous. But safety is improved.

Barnard agreed that it has an interesting dynamic, with one operator, two pieces of equipment, not an entire line crew. As for next steps, he passed the presentation on to Adam Coble, Monitoring Specialist to speak to the "operational" piece. They have been working to develop guidance, but as this system of harvesting is new there hasn't been a lot of study available so staff have been getting out on field tours to see firsthand the different types of equipment and different outcomes. At the Conference last week they were able to share some draft guidance with our Stewardship Foresters. With quite a bit of activity on the west side we have some very interested folks on both Northwest and Southwest RFPC so we will be pulling a workshop together with them to look through what we have come up with so far. The steady uptick in that activity keeps our Foresters busy with the additional workload reviewing those Plans for Alternate Practice. It also increases the workload for landowners as well in composing these plans. Our intent at this time is to move towards using Plans for Alternate Practice only as an exception, rather than a regular requirement. So they are looking at ways long term to try to figure out what we need to do with the rules, if there are any changes needed to align this more within the FPA. To that end, Coble has launched a literature review to help inform any later rule analysis to determine if there are pieces we should modify or change to better adapt to that technology.

Coble began that during the initial literature search he quickly realized this was indeed a relatively new technology. There has not been a lot of peer-reviewed publications on tethered logging its impacts on natural resources. There have been a few technical reports come out of New Zealand. There's research group at Oregon State that is doing some tethered logging research collaborating with Lone Rock looking at tethered

logging impacts on water infiltration, soil compaction, displacement, and those kinds of things. He has met with ODF geotechs as well as Weyerhaeuser geotechs for their input on the landslide/land form perspective and how that plays in. He is also looking for studies on the potential effects on soil moisture, soil mechanics and slope stability. He anticipated completing the literature review by early 2019 or sooner.

One member brought up the question of the use of these systems for mechanized fire line construction. (He was familiar with it being used last year on the Whitewater Fire.) As the equipment becomes more dispersed on the landscape and available for that, he sees that use coming up way more frequently.

Barnard shared that just based on a conference call the other day with Stewardship Foresters on the west side, and each had seen a Plan for Alternate Practice put into use on this activity and usually multiple plans. So its popularity has expanded even since last fall. A guest to the meeting suggested that it would be a good thing to make sure that the rules tie in with OROSHA if making it a standard practice.

Storm clarified that the OROSHA terminology they are using is a “research variance”. They are gathering information as they experience the safety issues and as the operators and industry learn more about using this new tool. He thought that it is pretty exciting to have a new tool like this in our business. To have innovation. To find ways that are a success for the environment, for the water and the soil as well as safe production.

Fledderjohann suggested that a big aspect is safety getting people off the ground with chainsaws. There should be a big emphasis on how much safer it is with that equipment.

Coble wanted the members to know that he just had a discussion recently regarding adding a section in the literature review for personal observation or anecdotal evidence to compile what people are seeing on the ground, especially Stewardship Foresters.

4. Siskiyou Streamside Literature Review and RipStream – Marganne Allen, Forest Health and Monitoring Manager

Allen began that the origins of this were a result of the Board’s approval of the changes to the Westside Riparian Rules for Salmon, Steelhead and Bull Trout. She thought it fair to characterize that the Board ultimately had some sense of unfinished business with other georegions in the State not covered by the new riparian rules, so when the Board approved the new Monitoring Strategy for the Private Forest Division they directed the Division to move forward working with stakeholders to look, to get feedback across both Eastern Oregon and the Siskiyou georegions which had not been included in that SSBT Rule process.

Staff were asked to inform the Board on what monitoring questions *would* be the highest priority to look at in one or both of those georegions. Ultimately, what we did was bring back information to the Board in stages. In July of 2017 we brought back the preliminary results from our survey that we did with stakeholders and with additional information January 2018 as well to frontload the Board with information to inform the Monitoring questions that would define that project criteria. In January of 2018 we brought a range of questions to the BOF everything from ‘take no action’; to do a very long term paired watershed type of study, like Trask or Alsea or the like; or a holistic approach to looking at riparian questions in either Eastern Oregon or Siskiyou. Accompanying the range of monitoring question alternatives was a tally of existing science that we could quickly find to inform that.

So ultimately, one thing that became clear after January was that the Board wanted to have firm direction from the Department on a narrow range and clear set of options to choose from. Allen continued that in March of this year we provided to them two options: One being ‘stay the course’ which is what we proposed back in 2016 which would enable us to do a significant expansion of the Compliance Audit and to finish what we had on the table as far as the westside Rip Stream questions. The next Option was to look at what we were calling a modified Siskiyou alternative, proposing to keep the scope narrower looking at Small and Medium Fish-bearing Streams only in the Siskiyou georegion using a variety of scientific sources, and contextual information such as fish status and trends from ODF&W as well as more contextual information from things like DEQ’s TMDL process. The rationale for us being that when we go out and do this kind of work, it’s important to have a good quality engagement with the people that we are going to be possibly affecting. She asked members to

keep in mind that when we engage with a monitoring project our work is not intended to change rules. Our work is to inform the Board about a question and to have them decide what an appropriate response to that question is. So, ultimately Board members chose that second alternative, narrowing the scope to the Siskiyou georegion to keep the scope manageable. In addition to a small expansion, modification to the Compliance Audit and finalizing the work for RipStream. She intimated that was not to say we will never look at Eastern Oregon. But for now our focus will be in Siskiyou. But the question of Eastern Oregon will remain open, as well as what the focus of that will be.

Member commented that he appreciated Tucker addressing that question. Speaking for the others he shared the concern that when that comes to the east side the Department shouldn't just apply the same questions that pertained to the west. They feel that the Siskiyou isn't representative of Eastern Oregon landscapes. Tucker agreed and pointed out that we can't meet the Protecting Cold Water Standard in wilderness areas. And there is a high degree of variability in data. She ensured folks that having Nils Christoffersen on the Board for Eastern Oregon will put an east side face to those future decisions.

Justice who addressed the Board regarding this decision agreed. Tucker offered that his time and report were very well received by the Board. Justice felt that they understood the message. He told the Committee that he reminded the Board what this RFPC does as an Advisory committee by providing stakeholder recommendations on forest practices. And as volunteers that's why they serve.

Tucker shared that one of the key things Marganne said at that meeting was these studies are unique and different. With public outreach and literature reviews on two drastically different geographic regions I think we just had to say, no we can't on a larger effort. Medema did recommend that the Eastern Oregon RFPC should be kept updated on the Siskiyou project.

Allen pointed out that Terry Frueh, Monitoring Coordinator is the project manager for both the Siskiyou work and RipStream work. Both efforts will have issues in common. Ariel Cowan, a new Monitoring Specialist is in the lead for the heavy lifting on the Siskiyou work and Adam Coble is working on RipStream and the rest of the west side work.

To orient everyone geographically, Frueh pointed out on the handout the area that defines the Siskiyou and the rest of the Western Oregon georegions where the RipStream Analysis was centered. And the chart also showed Private Industrial ownerships, federal and tribal forestlands, and then State forestlands.

Cowan brought a set of key messages to inform members on what this Siskiyou science review is in relation to other monitoring efforts. And again tying in with the fact that this process is what it could look like for any future Eastern Oregon analysis. So in March 2018 the Board gave us the green light to go forward with a science literature review looking at stream, shade, temperature and riparian forest conditions for the Siskiyou. In addition to with the associated contextual information to be gained from working with partner agencies, like DEQ, ODF&W, looking at water quality, fish status and trends for example. The scope for the Siskiyou Project is limited to Small and Medium Fish-bearing streams, and the Department will be conducting this review systematically and transparently to include stakeholders. So systematic reviews basically have a protocol built in for being rigorous and structured with a transparent method of selection of scientific literature with distinct criteria to select literature. The Board will make use of the results from this review so they can decide after our presentation of the study results that the FPA rules are working as designed; the FPA may not meet the stated objectives; additional study is warranted; or not action is needed. And the next step we will be developing that protocol searching for and deciding on the inclusion criteria. And then assess the evidence in that literature and including stakeholders at pre-defined steps in this process. So the next chance we will get to present our progress on this review will be at the September Board meeting of this year. We anticipate that we'll be able to complete this review step by early 2019.

Once we have developed a protocol it can still be adapted as we receive feedback. Frueh added that outreach will primarily be by email for most of the steps and with the RFPCs but we are not going to be limiting people who can participate. Although we certainly are going to be putting our energy into folks that have expressed interest. Cowan continued that the next chance for input will be when we are sending out the review protocols

defining what literature to include. Then after the inclusion/exclusion of literature collected meeting that protocol that will be the end of the first phase of the project. Then the second phase will begin in actually doing the review and presenting results at the Board meeting in the spring of next year. Frueh added that it seems to be helpful to the Board, for them to see things a few times so we will probably have an update in late winter 2019 bringing them as much of the information as available at that time so that they can digest it in relation to their decision. The rest of the completed work will be provided relatively soon thereafter for Board members to make a decision.

Frueh illustrated the decision framework by pointing out the work products involved. The Board has decided that the Department will do an analysis on the Siskiyou georegion for stream temperature and shade, and the riparian forest condition (aka Desired Future Condition). So in terms of products what they will bring to the Board for the Siskiyou will be:

- a science review on riparian forest condition;
- a science review on stream temperature and shade;
- contextual information from our partner agencies; and
- water quality evaluations from DEQ.

The RipStream project is split into two big groups of work:

- Desired Future Condition, or riparian forest conditions science review analyzing the field data collected in the RipStream study and the pre- and post-harvest data on the stand conditions. Modeling those stands into the future to see what they look like, using the forest gap model.
- Large Wood science review, using pre- and post-harvest data from RipStream and modeling the stand data into the future and combining it with a stream wood model that State Forest's Mark Meleason put together.

Both of these analysis packages will be brought to the Board for sufficiency decisions. This Western Oregon RipStream project will likely take longer than the Siskiyou because of the complexity involved and they are still working on the timeline. It is a pretty big lift for the Monitoring group to keep all this going.

Messinger suggested that the Siskiyou and RipStream projects wouldn't ordinarily come to the EO RFPC for review. But as this could influence any future protocols around an Eastern Oregon study he suggested members may want to get a chance to look at the science review protocol before publishing it. In particular he cautioned staff about the terminology change for Desired Future Condition, as it could be defined much differently on the east side of the State. Cowan reiterated that Desired Future Conditions will look different for different locations. They would likely go through the same process of developing the protocols specifically for Eastern Oregon or other locations.

Coble shared that the RipStream study in western Oregon was initiated 16 years ago and there is a lot of great data that still needs to be analyzed. So far the work that has come out of that, the reports, and publications focused on harvesting effects on stream temperature and shade and meeting water quality standards. But the Board also directed ODF to address whether the rules are effective in achieving Desired Future Conditions in western Oregon. To address whether rules are effective in achieving Desired Future Conditions we are using a three-pronged approach. 1. Conduct two science/literature reviews addressing Desired Future Conditions in western Oregon, 2. Large Wood review. 3. Run the data through models to predict how management practices effect riparian forests and large wood recruitment. The next steps will be updating the Board at the September meeting.

Allen then introduced John Hawksworth, Monitoring Specialist. John was present to update members briefly on the Compliance Audit. There were talking points provided in member's packets. Hawksworth assisted Paul Clements and Jeremy Groom in development of the current protocol we have to evaluate the QA/QC of the contractor's work, data analysis and report preparation. The Audit has been good for the Department's educational efforts and priorities. When the audit identifies rules that aren't showing good compliance that determines the focus of our landowner/operator training. And also, every so often we run into glitches in our internal ODF processes that need to be adjusted. For the past 5 year period we've contracted out to a third party to collect data on a suite of rules regarding waters of the state, water quality rules. Some of them having

to do with harvesting, some with roads. That contract has been completed and he is drafting the Compliance Audit Report for internal review. The next Audit out for contract will be a smaller more focused look at the compliance with reforestation rules. Just looking at actual current reforestation not asking for a determination of free-to-grow. Hawksworth will be developing protocols for that, and the staff will go through another round of landowner contacts for permissions and then put out the contract. We need to get permissions ahead of time so that the contractors will know what the statement of work is. That is pretty much where that effort stands right now. Allen wanted to clarify that what they are tightening the focus for the audit given the other workload we are facing. She added that in keeping it really narrow we won't be going into Plans for Alternate Practice. We want the focus on the simple ones. When there is a clear-cut harvest and were required to put baby trees in the ground.

5. Food Plots Rulemaking – Danny Norlander, Forest Health Survey Monitoring Specialist
Norlander shared that he was asked to help out and coordinate drafting the Wildlife Food Plot Rules. The Food Plots rulemaking was assigned to the Department through Legislative Statute in 2015. So unlike some of the other rulemaking stuff that's going on like Marbled Murrelets, which was a petition, the Legislature actually told us that we need to make these rules. So that was in 2015, in 2016 ODF presented a draft to get the guidance started. Due to other priorities, the rulemaking process was delayed so we've just gotten back to where we can draft rules for it. Keith Baldwin, Jennifer Weikel, and Angie Lane, (while working for the Department as Private Forests Policy Analyst before she left to OEM) also worked on this. It's been a very team-oriented project so far. The Advisory Committee for this will be the Committee for Family Forestlands as this statute covers acreages from 10 to 5000 acres so size-wise more small woodland owners. He plans on continuing to provide informational updates to the regional committees as well and welcomed any feedback they might have. He did highlight some questions that have come up in other discussions:

- Should we have target species? Whether that's undulates, deer, elk, wild horses, wild burros. Or upland game birds, turkey, grouse, that sort of thing. And one idea is to keep the target broad, make it less species specific. Make it more inclusive. Actually including things like pollinators. So at one of the previous meetings where this was discussed, Rex Storm actually brought up the idea of functional groups. He like the idea of being more inclusive than the traditional food plot mentality.
- Should we set a minimum food plot size? So the Legislature put maximums on the percentage of the ownership that can be developed for wildlife. The combined size of the wildlife food plots may not exceed:
 - (a) 2.5 percent of the forestland ownership less than 501 acres in size (*equals 0.25 to 12.5 acres*);
 - (b) 2.0 percent of the forestland ownership from 501 acres to 1,000 acres in size (*equals 10 to 20 acres*); or
 - (c) 1.0 percent of the forestland ownership over 1,000 acres to 4,999 acres in size (*equals 10 to 50 acres*).
- How would the food plots be arranged on the landscape? So if you have 50 acres, do you have ½ acre food plots scattered all over? Do they need to be contiguous? What if you want a strip through which would equal 10 acres or so through that landscape, what would that be like?
- What would be allowable plant species? One of the things that is laid out in the legislation is that we are supposed to coordinate with ODF&W. These plots are additional forage not habitat. But invasive species are out. But non-native plants? Or should we just stick to native plants? Tucker added to the question, What if landowners purchase food plot seed mixes made for the southern U.S. Norlander used an example of non-natives; tall fescue or Kentucky Bluegrass growing in the Willamette Valley. Should that be used up in forest lands?
- Then main concern, that we have had a lot of questions on, is 'What will the maintenance requirements be?' So this is not a Plan for Alternate Practice. This would be in the FPA rules as a regulated forest practice.
- Who and how would the plots be monitored? Is there going to be a timeline you are exempted from reforestation? Or is this going to be a permanent thing where we have to continually monitor that? If it is continual monitoring, who is going to do the monitoring? If the landowner is not maintaining the food plot that plot needs to be reforested, because this rule is only an exemption from reforestation for the duration of the maintained plot. So, that's going to be especially important at the smaller acreages. How

much time is the Stewardship Forester going to be able to go out and devote to monitoring that single ¼ acre on that land?

Baldwin shared an interesting question raised at one of the Cultural Resource Cluster meetings, about wolves and predators. The unintended consequence of having food plots attracting predators as well as the target species. He shared that cougars and other wildlife are important species to the tribes and coaxing predators onto urban and rural interface lands may lead to the predator being targeted. Norlander agreed that there probably are unintended consequences that will be seen with wildlife and neighbors. So if they have a lot more deer or elk coming in and the neighbor may be trying to grow cedar, they may be impacted pretty severely.

Some other suggestions have been doing blanket approvals for small landowners, small areas. And streamlining the process that would make it easier for people to do this. But this is completely voluntary. It is of interest to the Board because preserving wildlife is one of their values. Since the legislation we've had 3 landowners apply and 1 approved on the landscape.

Abraham shared they will use the Committee for Family Forestlands to flesh out some of those questions and develop some framework. The draft plan is to go to the Board in November to help get that process kick started to develop rule language. He thought that the struggle will be to bring this back to the reality of what we can reasonably expect to do with the resources we have.

6. Incentives Update – Ryan Gordon/Nate Agalzoff

Ryan Gordon, introduced himself as the Family Forestland Coordinator in the Private Forests Division. He was joined by Nate Agalzoff (who is ordinarily a Stewardship Forester up in Forest Grove). Agalzoff joined Salem staff in a developmental opportunity to serve as the interim Incentives Program Field Coordinator. They have talked with each of the Regional Forest Practices Committees, about the Landowner Assistance Program that lives within the Private Forests Division. He did want to note, particularly in Eastern Oregon, there are a lot of really good partnerships across the landscape which members are probably aware of. Partnerships that have developed around non-industrial forestland owners has really helped us to build some capacity and more boots on the ground. Those relationships are facilitating some really targeted investments in pre-commercial activity that helped to improve forest health and resiliency to fire are of great importance on the eastside in particular.

He thought for the most part members are probably pretty familiar with a lot of our core business around implementation of the FPA, monitoring and forest health. But members maybe a little bit less familiar with the fact that the Program operates a seed orchard, an Urban & Community Forestry Program and the Landowner Assistance Program within the Division as well. The Landowner Assistance Program is specifically connected to the Woodland Management Act of 1979, which is kind of our organizing statute and directs the Department to provide technical assistance to non-industrial private landowners. Unfortunately that task has been unfunded for pretty much the entire time it's been on the books. But is a really important part of our core business. Non-Industrial private forestlands provide multiple public benefits and make a significant contribution to the working forest landscape in Oregon. In order to meet that technical assistance responsibility, we work really hard to leverage a lot of Federal programs, both through the U.S. Forest Service, the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Farm Service Agency. This kind of work is really about building those organizational relationships with other State, Federal and Non-Governmental organizations at the ground level. So the Incentives Program Field Coordinator is really the direct link between those programs and the field.

Agalzoff took over the conversation noting the complexity of these programs. He wanted to emphasize that Stewardship Foresters are the Department's primary point of contact for the FPA and also for the Landowner Assistance programs. As a quick breakdown, *financial assistance* programs are the dollars or cost-share that support actually getting projects accomplished on the ground and the *technical assistance* provides support in implementing management goals or operations.

The USFS through their State & Private Forestry program has been our traditional partner but over the last ten years or so, there has been a decline in the amount of funds available. The expectation is that they will continue to be a partner for the Stewardship work on forest management plans and beetles and that sort of thing. But looking ahead, the NRCS is going to be the model for the future funding and implementation. What's

nice about the NRCS model is there is an increased level of local control. So the last 4 to 5 years the Farm Service Agency has been a relatively new partner, and that is largely through the EFRP, the Emergency Forest Restoration Program. Although used mostly for fire damage, it would also pertain to drought projects and ice storms and other things because it is basically a crop failure program. So, by providing that forestry expertise we are helping to align forestry needs with the NRCS traditionally agricultural programs. Relatively recent changes to the Farm Bill have allowed assistance to be provided to non-industrial forest landowners. As their experience was predominately agricultural, our technical assistance role has been pretty valuable in the implementation and input for the development of their Conservation Implementation Strategies. CIS's are used on a geographic area with focused pre-identified resource concerns to achieve greater impact on more of a landscape context. So the NRCS and USFS Joint Chiefs Initiative has been tackling this idea of how to address resource concerns at more of a landscape level. And Joint Chiefs is one of the tools to accomplish that. That allows them to award resources through some of their existing programs and ODF as a partner can provide that technical assistance through their EQIP programs and things of that nature. Those projects often focus is on fuels reduction, water quality and improvement of habitat for wildlife. And the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCP) is similar in a way but its NRCS only. It allows NRCS to again, address these things across a more landscape context but they are able to leverage funds available in other programs that they administer. This network of partnerships has been pretty critical to putting proposals together. And ODF has been traditionally a facilitator in trying to get these things off the ground.

Gordon admitted it is a challenge to blend all of these various federal funding sources together to create full time positions and at the same time remain focused on the plethora of projects and the work of those partners that help support those projects. One of the great things about these is that they do take an All Lands Approach on the Federal side and the private landowner side particularly with those Joint Chiefs Projects. We can't really affect a good treatment at a landscape scale if we are not looking at both sides of the ownership fence.

He continued wanting to provide some perspective on our Federal Forest Restoration Program. That program is putting these All Lands projects together and being able to serve needs on both sides of the fence. He thought it a really positive tool for the Department. And it really focuses in two different areas. One is actually helping to build the community capacity, the social capacity to actually move work forwards on federal ground. And the other side is actually helping to bolster the Federal agency capacity to get work done on federal lands. Through the Good Neighbor Authority we are actually able to use State resources on federal grounds to lay out and sell timber. He brought up the Paddock Butte sale in southern Oregon as an example. It is the first sale under the Good Neighbor Authority in Oregon comprised by about 800 acres of Forest Service land that is surrounded by a private holding, the Gerber Ranch. And we've put a lot of cost-share dollars into pre-commercial thinning work on the Gerber Ranch, now we are able to actually get some work done on that federal ground that is in the middle of it to treat that entire chunk of land. And that's kind of the value that I see of this program from my perspective working on the private lands side as we move forward.

Medema wanted to mention while on that topic that there's another really huge key bullet that with these programs operating we've got additional capacity on the eastside that we wouldn't normally have through our Fire budgets. We've had 5 person crews working last summer. We were able to pull Limited Duration NRS1s that were out helping and those positions represent key leadership for fire. We don't like to increase fire budgets, so there's a huge piece on the eastside for me that is added capacity, significant added capacity that is available. Gordon agreed added capacity underscores how cross program/division a lot of this work is that we are talking about. Because we really are looking at joining opportunities between Protection and Private Forests and now the Federal Forests Restoration Program to build this kind of capacity. The Eastern Oregon Area has done a really great job in particular at leveraging that capacity on the ground.

To finish up Gordon wanted to acknowledge another partnership, the Partnership for Forestry Education which started back in 2010. We got some grant dollars from the Forest Service and have put together a number of self-help tools for landowners who are interested in considering management of some type on their land. And the repository for all that is on the OFRI website, www.KnowYourForests.org The Partnership is made up of a broad group of State and Federal as well as non-governmental organizations. A lot of real resources for small landowners can be found at that site.

Gordon added to that Thomas Whittington (who is ordinarily our Incentives Program Field Coordinator in Salem) was available because of the Statewide Agreement we have with NRCS to partner up in a unique way. Because of retirements and budget freeze federally the NRCS was without their State Forester and really needed our help. We sent Thomas up to work in the interim as their State Forester in the Portland office. And it's been a great opportunity to help build that partnership between the two agencies and increase some understanding and working capacity in both directions. It's been a really valuable opportunity.

Messinger asked about the outlook for the Federal budget and funding of these programs. Gordon reminded members that the NFS State and Private Forestry is just a small piece of Forest Service business. And acknowledged that it has taken some pretty significant hits in the last couple of years, especially to Stewardship and Forest Health funding. He hadn't gotten any clear indications from leadership at NRCS, but the Farm Bill is currently under discussion. Indications seem to be that a lot of those programs are projected to stay in the Farm Bill and continue to include forest operators/landowners as well. So he's expecting that this business model and trend will continue. He thought that focus will continue also to be on these All Lands projects. The agencies and policymakers are really interested in seeing broad impacts and seeing investments in established local partnerships that can work across boundaries. We've been fortunate in Oregon to really kind of be on the front of that curve bringing those dollars in.

Medema offered that from his perspective he sees three vehicles into the future. Clearly one is the Farm Bill and NRCS. Two is the Cohesive Wildfire Strategy that's really geared around managing of pieces of funding through the fire side. But as that strategy continues forward that's really key leverage point. And then Good Neighbor Authority. That is what he is watching and investing time in just because he considers that the future.

Tucker asked Medema if he could provide any predictions for this fire season.

He shared that from his perspective looking at predictive services and tracking where we are with snowpack, it's below normal. And that indicator makes him nervous. Predictive services has Klamath up through Central Oregon for an above average fire season. Rangeland folks are very concerned and are already running on 1000+ acre fires out in the desert country. They are saying its drier than normal and are pretty worried. He was thinking canyon country is going to be a real challenge this year and will be dependent on the amount of lightning that we get. Meteorologists are setting up for a pretty heavy monsoon push from the Four Corners and that generally means lightning for the east side and southern Oregon. So he predicted that it's going to be fairly active fire season but they have ready resources to provide an adequate level of protection. He heard some presentations from BLM and Forest Service that there are some challenges for different fire positions being filled. He noted they are generally busy no matter what on the east side.

7. Good of the Order/Next Meeting/Topics/Dates

Messinger requested the group set up a date for the next meeting.

Abraham offered that the group Operator of the Year Tour is the third week in October and the potential to combine the meeting with the tour to gain some efficiency in travel. If there was a quorum available to tour he suggested a vote could be taken quickly. Medema asked that we don't schedule that over the top of the fall association meetings that are at the very end of October and November 1 & 2. Abraham offered to figure out in terms of timing how we want to approach that and just send out some preliminary dates and see how they resonate with folks and try to get something on the calendar.

Lena reminded them that we want to bring the Committee things that are timely and of interest and make the best use of your time. Messinger again requested ongoing updates on the Riparian analysis projects. It's important to know what the Department is going to do with that compilation of literature and what that means to the Department as far as setting a precedent for these literature reviews. Abraham added that they will be in touch when the protocol is developed for the Siskiyou literature review, but not during a busy fire season.

Messinger adjourned the meeting.