



**Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF)**  
**Senate Bill 762 Forest Resiliency and**  
**Restoration Investments Work Group**  
**October 21st, 2021**

**Work Group Members:** Amanda Astor, Emily Jane Davis, Dana Skelly, Andrew Owen, Pete Caligiuri, Dallas Hall Defrees and Chandra LeGue

**Technical Advisors:** Dr. Christopher Dunn, Mari Kramer, Eric Hartstien, Kaola Swanson, Zachary Seeger, James Dickinson

**ODF Staff:** Jeff Burns, Ryan Gordon, Alex Rahmlow, Derek Gasperini, Kyle Sullivan, Jason Pettigrew and Megan Ehle

Ryan Gordon opened the meeting with options to more effectively tell the ODF's story by leveraging the position authority that the department received with SB 762 and helping with data collection and monitoring and find efficiencies across the board to better report out those findings. Members in the group were excited for the opportunity and some members asked what would be lost in shifting some of the focus to data collection. Ryan stated that this flexible approach could work by splitting the difference between data collection and field.

Kyle Sullivan provided a [presentation](#) on the Federal Forest Restoration Program and potential investment opportunities.

Discussions that arose:

- Project management funding.

- Moving 400K into planning and capacity building within the FFR Program budget.

- Funding these programs based on any excess dollars that don't get allocated via the competitive RFP process?

- Supporting implementation of projects with 762 funding.

- Should these be NEPA ready projects?

- What are the actual on the ground accomplishments?

- Maybe any funds for FFR should have to go through the RFP competitive process to ensure projects are appropriate for funding?

Jeff Burns shifted the conversation and wanted to close the loop on where the work group landed with the tag and extend opportunities.

Discussions that arose:

Tag and extend projects be quickly evaluated against the RFP criteria and approved assuming they meet at least 60% threshold on scoring? With some cap on total money available? maybe \$5M?

Location in four highest risk classes? What are we missing that the map doesn't incorporate?

Additional vetting, modified application or filter.

Consider staff workload on applying and awarding projects.

Consider CFLR's.

What portion of money goes to tag and extend, do they need to have match, do they meet the right criteria are important, should all projects go through the RFP process.

The group then shifted towards reviewing the request for proposal language and are to follow up with draft language via email.

Next steps:

Update [FRRIP webpage](#)

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

Next Meeting – October 28<sup>th</sup> 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

Homework for the Work Group: RFP language edit by Oct 26<sup>th</sup> with a proposed RFP out by Nov 2 or 3